

The Early History of the Hagiopolitan Daily Office in Constantinople

New Perspectives on the Formative Period of the Byzantine Rite

STIG SIMEON R. FRØYSHOV

The Jerusalem Daily Office in Constantinople: The Standard Paradigm and the Need for a New One

Contrary to what one would expect, what is known from late Byzantine times onward as the Byzantine Daily Office—the cycle of daily services—originated neither in the city, in the regional church, nor even in the patriarchate of Constantinople.¹ It originated in Palestine, more precisely in the cathedral of Jerusalem,² and was at some point adopted and embraced in

Constantinople, as it was in Armenia and Georgia. While the transmission of the Jerusalem Daily Office to the Caucasian churches no doubt took place over the course of the fifth century, that to Constantinople and its regional church took place later—but, I argue in this article, considerably earlier than hitherto thought.

There was in Constantinople at least one other old, local, indigenous Daily Office, that of the public rite of Hagia Sophia.³ Thus, after the introduction of the Jerusalem Daily Office, there coexisted in Constantinople for centuries two different major traditions for the Daily Office.⁴ Each constituted the liturgical tradition of a major ecclesiastical center of Greek Christianity: one the cathedral of Constantinople, Hagia Sophia, and the other the cathedral of Jerusalem, the Anastasis, the church of the Resurrection.⁵ From at least the ninth century onward, one finds in Constantinople a verbal differentiation between the two Daily

1 For the sake of clarity, I here distinguish between *office*, meaning the complete Daily Office system, and *service*, meaning a particular service of the office (vespers, first hour, etc.).

2 I have argued for the important claim that the Palestinian Daily Office originated in the cathedral of Jerusalem, and not in the Great Lavra of St. Sabas or another monastery, in recent studies on the early Greek, Georgian, and Armenian Books of Hours. My first study to make this point was S. Frøyshov, “L’Horologe ‘géorgien’ du Sinaiticus ibericus 34: Edition, traduction et commentaire” (PhD diss., University of Paris-Sorbonne, Paris IV, 2003; corrected ed., 2004), which provides an edition and study of the ancient Georgian Horologion, reflecting a Greek model of the cathedral of Jerusalem. See further idem, “Erlangen University Library A2, A.D. 1025: A Study of the Oldest Dated Greek Horologion,” in *Rites and Rituals of the Christian East*, ed. B. Groen, D. Galadza, N. Glibetic, and G. Radle, *Eastern Christian Studies* 12 (Leuven, 2014), 201–53, esp. 238–39, and idem, “The Book of Hours of Armenia and Jerusalem: An Examination of the Relationship between the *Žamagirk*’ and the *Horologion*,” in *Studies in Oriental Liturgy*, ed. B. Groen, D. Galadza, N. Glibetic, and G. Radle, *Eastern Christian Studies* 28 (Leuven, 2019), 107–55.

3 On the Daily Office of Hagia Sophia, see S. Parenti, “The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople: Evolution of a Local Tradition,” *OCP* (2011): 440–69, and especially the extensive study by G. M. Hanke, *Vesper und Orthros des Kathedralritus der Hagia Sophia zu Konstantinopel*, 2 vols. (Münster, 2018).

4 In addition to these main traditions, there were also minor ones, such as the Daily Office of the *Akoimatoi* monks. This Daily Office will not be treated here, since it is not directly related to our topic.

5 On the non-Daily Office part of the Jerusalem rite—that is, the Liturgy of St. James, the calendar, and the lectionary—see the recent study by D. Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2018).

Office traditions: the Constantinopolitan Daily Office was called Ἐκκλησιαστής, “Ekklesiastes”⁶ (after Ἡ Μεγάλη Ἐκκλησία, the “Great Church”); the Jerusalem Daily Office, Ἀγιοπολίτης, “Hagiopolites” (after Ἡ Ἁγία Πόλις, the Holy City). That terminological distinction is followed here with the English terms *Ecclesiastic* and *Hagiopolitan*.⁷

The Hagiopolitan Daily Office was of the tradition of Jerusalem, but once planted in Constantinople it took on a life on its own. *Hagiopolites* was no doubt the term coined by the Constantinopolitans for *their* variant of the Daily Office of Jerusalem tradition,⁸ which initially was oriented toward Jerusalem as a peripheral location to its center while also providing opportunities for distinct innovations, such as new hymnography. Quite early, as discussed below, another innovation, which concerned not the Daily Office per se but its immediate ritual context, was launched: the Jerusalem Daily Office became detached from the rest of the Jerusalem rite and linked to the “non-Daily Office” part of the rite of Hagia Sophia. This synthesis constitutes the formative stage of the Byzantine rite.⁹ I will here reserve the term *Hagiopolitan* for that Jerusalem Daily Office that forms part of the Byzantine rite.¹⁰ The contributions of the rite of Hagia Sophia to the synthesis were the sacraments and other presbyteral prayers, the lectionary, and the ecclesiastical calendar, represented by the two liturgical books of the Euchologion and the so-called

Typikon of the Great Church (more correctly termed the “Kanonarion-Synaxarion”).¹¹

The two Daily Office traditions were mutual influences and perhaps rivals. The outcome was the dominance of the Jerusalem Daily Office tradition, not only in the Church of Constantinople but in the whole Orthodox world. Most scholars have held that this process began slowly in the middle Byzantine period and concluded only in the late Byzantine. But this view has come under scrutiny. In an important article on the cathedral rite of Constantinople, Stefano Parenti argued that the Hagiopolitan Daily Office spread and influenced the Ecclesiastic Daily Office of Hagia Sophia earlier than previously thought.¹² Building on Parenti’s observations, which deal largely with events from the tenth century and later, this article will go further and more deeply into the matter, recovering an earlier history, hitherto not adequately recognized, of the Hagiopolitan Daily Office in Constantinople from roughly the sixth to the tenth centuries.

6 On *Ekklesiastes* as a technical term denoting the Daily Office of Hagia Sophia, see Parenti, “The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople,” 451.

7 These two terms will also be applied to “the Ecclesiastic Office” and “the Hagiopolitan Office” for the period before the ninth century, and more broadly as adjectives (e.g., “the Ecclesiastic Psalter”).

8 There is no evidence for “Hagiopolites” being used by the people in and around Jerusalem: none of the references for ἀγιοπολίτης in *LBG* comes from a text of Palestinian origin. The use of the word seems Constantinopolitan/Byzantine. Theodore the Studite employs it as an epithet for the Jerusalemite Michael Synkellos in the title of his letter to him (*Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, ed. G. Fatouros, 2 vols. [Berlin, 1992], 2:827, letter 547).

9 Note that the “Byzantine rite” here does not denote the rite of Hagia Sophia, but the mixed rite that became the second millennium Byzantine and received Orthodox liturgy.

10 I therefore will not call “Hagiopolitan” the practice of the Jerusalem Daily Office in Constantinople before this synthesis.

11 For the edition of a Euchologion manuscript dating from the period on which I focus here, the late eighth-century Vatican Barberini gr. 336, see S. Parenti and E. Velkovska, eds., *L'eucologio Barberini gr. 336*, 2nd rev. ed. (Rome, 2000). The Kanonarion-Synaxarion was edited in J. Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le typicon de la Grande Église*, OCA 165–66, 2 vols. (Rome, 1962–63). Two witnesses of this Kanonarion-Synaxarion deserve particular mention. The main witness of Mateos’s edition is Jerusalem Greek Orthodox Patriarchate MS Holy Cross 40, whose content is commonly dated between 945 and 959 (see A. Luzzi, “Precisazioni sull’epoca di formazione del Sinassario di Costantinopoli,” *RBSN* 36 (1999) [2000]: 75–91, esp. 86–87); it is of the recension promoted by Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos. The other witness, which is of an earlier recension, is Patmos Monastery of Saint John the Theologian MS 266, edited separately in A. A. Dmitrievsky, *Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopisei* [Description of liturgical manuscripts], 2 vols. (Kiev, 1895–1901), 1:1–152. Its content is judged by Andrea Luzzi to predate the Macedonian rewritings carried out at the end of the ninth century or the beginning of the tenth century, a dating to which I adhere (see A. Luzzi, “Il Patmiacus 266: Un testimone dell’utilizzo liturgico delle epitomi premetafrastiche,” *RBSN* 49 (2012) [2013]: 239–61, esp. 240 and 260, respectively).

12 Parenti, “The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople,” 454–56, 458 (quotation): “But what matters most is that this basic rite [of Hagiopolitan vespers], which was not that of the cathedral, was celebrated in other καθολικά, in house churches, and monasteries—in short, everywhere!” Parenti here shows the great spread of Hagiopolitan vespers in Constantinople by 1027, the date of the manuscript he is commenting on, which is a significant adjustment of the usual dating to the thirteenth century. In this article, however, I argue that the extensive spread of the Hagiopolitan Daily Office took place even earlier than that.

The Jerusalem and Hagiopolitan Daily Office

Any Daily Office typically contains four elements: service structures, psalmody (with a liturgical distribution of the Psalter), hymnography, and prayers. The Jerusalem Daily Office and its Hagiopolitan variant in Constantinople constituted basically the same tradition.¹³ In this tradition the service structure followed a Book of Hours called Ὡρολόγιον (Horologion), containing the fixed parts of the daily services.¹⁴

The Jerusalem Daily Office continuously evolved. The fifth- to sixth-century daily cursus in Jerusalem was sevenfold: nocturns; matins; third, sixth, and ninth hours; vespers; and compline.¹⁵ By the seventh century, what I here call a “reform” had taken place. The daily cursus had been significantly augmented and reorganized: new services had been added, including the first hour, midnight, and a whole series of small hours. As a result, the daily cursus of Jerusalem was boosted to twenty-four services, starting with the first

hour.¹⁶ This reform seems to have had limited effect on the Hagiopolitan Daily Office of Constantinople, which apparently never started with the first hour nor had a twenty-four-hour cursus; it did, however, add the first hour. Somewhat later, both in Palestine and Constantinople, nocturns and matins were merged into a mixed service still called matins. As we can glean from the sources, until the ninth–tenth centuries the Hagiopolitan cursus typically was as follows: matins; first, third, sixth, and ninth hours; vespers; and compline.¹⁷

The Jerusalem and Hagiopolitan Psalter had a double organization. The first level contained sixty textual units of about two or three psalms each, while a second one had twenty larger units, each one encompassing three smaller units.¹⁸ The smaller unit was originally called an *antiphon*, but in time, and perhaps starting in Constantinople, the terms *doxa* or *stasis* became common; the larger unit was labeled *kathisma*.¹⁹ In addition to the psalms, Jerusalem and Hagiopolitan Psalters appended a series of nine biblical canticles (more accurately ten, since the last contains two canticles). The Psalter units were used both in some fixed, selected way—for example, a particular *kathisma* assigned to a particular daily service²⁰—and in a continuous way, with *kathismata* distributed over a given period of time (a week, two weeks, a day).²¹

The Jerusalem Daily Office saw the development of a rich hymnographic corpus, gathered from the

13 To date, there exists no global study of the Jerusalem Daily Office. See my works cited in n. 2, as well as the relevant parts of S. Frøyshov, “The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy: New Sources and Studies,” in *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship: Acts of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Rome, 17–21 September 2008*, ed. B. Groen, S. Hawkes-Teeples, and S. Alexopoulos (Louvain, 2012), 227–67. For services of or pertaining to the Daily Office in Jerusalem in Holy Week, see S. Janeras, *Le Vendredi-Saint dans la tradition liturgique byzantine: Structure et histoire de ses offices* (Rome, 1988); M. Morozowich, “Jerusalem Celebrations of Matins and the Hours in Great Week from Monday to Wednesday,” *OCP* 77 (2011): 423–47; and idem, “Jerusalem Celebration of Great Week Evening Services from Monday to Wednesday in the First Millennium,” *Studi sull’Oriente Cristiano* 14 (2010): 99–126.

14 For a general presentation of the history of the Horologion and for more on the points made in this paragraph, see S. Frøyshov, “The Palestino-Byzantine Horologion: A First Attempt at Historical Overview and Typology” (forthcoming). On particular manuscripts, see J. Mateos, “Un Horologion inédit de Saint-Sabas: Le Codex sinas itique grec 863 (IX^e siècle),” in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, 7 vols. (Vatican City, 1964), 3.1: 47–76, complemented by S. Parenti, “Un fascicolo ritrovato dell’horologion Sinai gr. 863 (IX secolo),” *OCP* 75 (2009): 343–58; Frøyshov, “Erlangen University Library A” (n. 2 above). The recent monograph of J. C. Anderson and S. Parenti, *A Byzantine Monastic Office, 1105 A.D. Houghton Library, MS gr. 3* (Washington, DC, 2016), concerns a later Horologion that is of little relevance for our purposes here.

15 The Presanctified Liturgy (PRES) here followed the ninth hour, but the PRES strictly speaking does not belong to the Daily Office.

16 See the Horologia of Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Georgian MS 34 and Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Georgian MS N.23 (for more on these, see Frøyshov, “Erlangen University Library A2” [n. 2 above], 206, where they are abbreviated as GEO and GEO-Con, respectively).

17 The PRES appeared variously after the ninth hour and the sixth hour. In the ninth to tenth centuries a particular type of midnight service entered some Horologia, such as the late tenth-century Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Greek MS NE M 46.

18 For a general presentation of this Psalter, see G. Parpulov, *Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters, ca. 850–1350 AD* (Plovdiv, 2014).

19 For more on the history of the terms of the Jerusalem Psalter units, see S. R. Frøyshov, “Kafizma,” *Pravoslavnaia Entsiklopediia* 32 (2014): 114–17, esp. 114–15. See also Parpulov, *Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters*, 54–55.

20 E.g., in an early period *kathisma* 17 (Psalms 119–33) was used at daily vespers throughout the year; later it was used only at Lent.

21 See J. Mateos, “La psalmodie variable dans l’office byzantin,” *Acta Philosophica et Theologica* 2 (1964): 327–31.

fifth to sixth century onward in the hymnal called the *Tropologion*.²² The Tropologion was a global hymnal, encompassing hymns of the fixed cycle: it contained the feast of fixed dates; the movable, Paschal cycle; and the weekly cycle, consisting of eight weeks of the eight modes. By the ninth century most Tropologia were divided into separate hymnals: Menaion for the fixed dates, Triodion(-Pentekostarion) for the Paschal cycle, and the Parakletikon (or Oktoechos) for the weekly hymns. The main hymn genres of the Jerusalem tradition are the sticheron and the kanon. The stichera represent stanzas inserted mostly into fixed psalms of vespers and matins; the kanon stanzas were inserted mostly into the biblical canticles of matins.²³ This hymnography will play a significant role in the present article.

The prayers of the Jerusalem Daily Office were primarily those of the Euchologion (of Jerusalem).²⁴ Certain supplementary services had other prayers.²⁵ The Hagiopolitan Daily Office no longer used the Euchologion of Jerusalem, and the prayers of the Euchologion of Constantinople that it did use did not necessarily fit the structure of the Hagiopolitan services. In the course of time, many new prayers were composed, independently of the Euchologion of Constantinople, and added to the Hagiopolitan Daily Office.

*The Standard Paradigm of the Adoption,
Evolution, and Milieu of the
Palestinian Daily Office in Constantinople*

The adoption in Constantinople of the Jerusalem Daily Office raises many questions. When did the importation of this ritual happen and in what social context—in

monasteries or a public church context, or both? In what contexts did the Hagiopolitan Daily Office subsequently spread and develop in Constantinople? How did it become the predominant Daily Office in the imperial capital? Our focus will be on *what* happened, and only a little on *why* the Hagiopolitan Daily Office expanded in Constantinople and in the end was preferred to the Ecclesiastic Daily Office; the latter question requires a separate study. I will challenge what has become a standard paradigm concerning these questions and propose a new narrative.

The standard paradigm regarding the existence of the two Daily Office traditions in Constantinople, and by extension in Byzantium, no doubt goes back to Russian liturgical scholarship from the late nineteenth century to the Revolution and to the work of Anton Baumstark.²⁶ It was taken over and further developed by scholars at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, such as Juan Mateos and Robert Taft,²⁷ and subsequently it has been more or less universally accepted.

This paradigm of liturgical history in Constantinople and Byzantium, in its most common variant, may be outlined as follows. The two Daily Office traditions are perceived in a sociologically and ecclesiastically dichotomous way: while the Ecclesiastic Office is the Byzantine “cathedral office,” performed in the secular (nonmonastic) churches and intended for the people, the Hagiopolitan Office is the Byzantine “monastic office,” limited to performance in monasteries. Consequently, the Hagiopolitan Office with its hymnography (primarily the kanon and sticheron) is seen as expressing a monastic theology and spirituality.²⁸ The origin of the Hagiopolitan Office is thought to lie in Palestinian

22 For a recent study on the Tropologion, see S. Kujumdzieva, *The Hymnographic Book of Tropologion* (Abingdon, UK, 2018). See also Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem* (n. 5 above), 52–56.

23 For a global presentation of the hymnography of the Jerusalem (including Hagiopolitan/Byzantine) tradition, see S. Frøyshov's entries in the online *Canterbury Dictionary of Hymnology* (2013): “Greek Hymnody,” “Rite of Jerusalem,” and “Byzantine Rite” (<https://hymnology.hymnsam.co.uk>). For tables showing the structures of vespers and matins of the Jerusalem/Hagiopolitan tradition, see idem, “Erlangen University Library A2” (n. 2 above) and “The Book of Hours of Armenia and Jerusalem” (n. 2 above).

24 For the Jerusalem Euchologion, see H. Brakmann and T. Chronz, “Ist das Jerusalemer Euchologion noch zu retten?,” *ALW* 54 (2012): 1–28, and Frøyshov, “The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy” (n. 13 above), 241–44.

25 E.g., in the two Horologia mentioned in n. 16.

26 See, e.g., the seminal monograph by I. N. Mansvetov, *TSerkovnyi ustav (Tipik), ego obrazovanie i sud'ba v grecheskoï i russkoï tserkvi* [The Ecclesiastical Rule (Typikon), its formation and destiny in the Greek and Russian Church] (Moscow, 1885), 229–30; A. Baumstark, “Denkmäler der Entstehungsgeschichte des byzantinischen Ritus,” *OC*, ser. 3, 2 (1927): 1–32, esp. 22–26.

27 J. Mateos, “Quelques problèmes de l'orthros byzantin,” *PrOC* 11 (1961): 17–35, 201–20; and see, e.g., R. F. Taft, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville, MN, 1992).

28 For an example of how this liturgical scholarship has been assimilated into general Byzantine studies, see L. Brubaker and J. F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca 680–850): The Sources: An Annotated Survey* (Aldershot, 2001), 261: “In fact, it has been demonstrated that the canon [hymn] remained a specifically monastic form, for use in the monastic rather than the cathedral rite.”

monasticism, most often the Great Lavra of St. Sabas.²⁹ On this account, the Hagiopolitan Office, understood as a Palestinian monastic office, was introduced in Constantinople by St. Theodore the Studite, who had encountered it in Bithynian monasticism, among descendants of Palestinian refugees, and brought it with him when he moved with his disciples to the Stoudios monastery in 798.³⁰ To St. Theodore was also due the fusion of a Palestinian Daily Office with the Euchologion and the lectionary of Hagia Sophia, understood as the “Studite liturgical synthesis” or the “middle Byzantine liturgical synthesis” that combined a monastic and a cathedral tradition, respectively.³¹ From then on, until the thirteenth century, the “monastic office” was connected primarily with Studite monasticism and its Studite “poetic school”³² (building on a “Sabaite school of hymnography”), its Studite *Typikon* (rule book), and so forth. With the Greek reconquest of Constantinople in the thirteenth century, the “monastic office” superseded the “cathedral office” and was the Daily Office employed when Greek worship was resumed in Hagia Sophia in 1261.

Part of this paradigm, of course, is inarguable: that the Daily Office of Studite monasticism was one variant of the Hagiopolitan Office is obvious from the sources and does not need to be demonstrated here. Many non-Studite monasteries also observed the Hagiopolitan Office.³³ But however broadly accepted the standard paradigm may be, there are major problems with

it—some revealed by recent advances in liturgical scholarship, others pertaining to well-known evidence or material. First, concerning the ecclesiastical status of the Hagiopolitan Office, it is clear that the Georgian version of the early (ca. pre-600) Jerusalem rite, including the hymnal,³⁴ conclusively shows the Jerusalem liturgy to be primarily “cathedral”—that is, sociologically the liturgy of the Resurrection cathedral and typologically a public liturgy. Consequently, what was adopted in Constantinople was in no sense a monastic liturgy of Palestine but was essentially the Daily Office of the Jerusalem cathedral,³⁵ though it may have been channeled to some degree through Palestinian monasteries.³⁶

Second, concerning chronology, the standard paradigm oddly fails to account for the two prominent and foundational seventh- and eighth-century hymnographers that were active in Constantinople, SS. Germanos and Andrew. Long before St. Theodore settled at Stoudios they wrote kanons and stichera, hymn genres normally belonging to the Hagiopolitan Daily Office. At the very least, any theory of the adoption of the Jerusalem Daily Office in Constantinople must necessarily take into account these kanons and stichera and try to explain their purpose.³⁷

Third, what are we to do with the long, consecutive series of eighth-, ninth-, and tenth-century non-Studite hymnographers (many of whom were not even monks) attached to the Great Palace or the

29 E.g., see Taft, *The Byzantine Rite*, 58: “It was this office of St. Sabas . . . that the Studites synthesized with material from the . . . cathedral office of the Great Church to create the hybrid Studite office.”

30 To cite just one of the more recent publications, Parenti, “The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople” (n. 3 above): “The Cathedral liturgical *typos* was confronted with the monastic *typos* of the Middle East spread by the Studites” (453); “the office of Hagiopolite monks imported by the Studite monks” (464); “Sabaitic Vespers” (462).

31 E.g., see A. Rentel, “Byzantine and Slavic Orthodoxy,” in *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, ed. G. Wainwright and K. B. W. Tucker (Oxford, 2006), 254–306, esp. 260–70.

32 See, e.g., A. Kazhdan, D. E. Conomos, and N. P. Ševčenko, “Joseph the Hymnographer,” *ODB* 2:1074: “Joseph belonged to the poetic school of Stoudios.” He wrote hymns of Hagiopolitan genres but is not known to have had any particular connection with Stoudios.

33 Though several Hagiopolitan hymnographers mentioned below, such as Patriarch Ignatios and Joseph the Hymnographer, in certain periods dwelled in monasteries, those were not Studite.

34 The so-called Old Iadgari, the Georgian version of the old Jerusalem hymnal (*Tropologion*), was edited only in 1979 and 1980; previously, only a Russian translation of a very small part of it existed. See Frøyshov, “The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy” (n. 13 above), 249–53.

35 The standard paradigm might be said to have overlooked the *polis* in *Hagiopolites*. The liturgy of course had some elements that were performed by cathedral monastics, primarily variable psalmody (stichology), but the same was true of the Ecclesiastic Office, which is considered a “cathedral office.”

36 No doubt, Sabaite liturgy was basically just a variant of the liturgy of the Resurrection cathedral. See D. Galadza, “Liturgy at the Great Lavra of St. Sabas from Its Beginnings to the First Crusade: A Preliminary Survey,” *OCP* 85 (2019): 113–38, and S. Frøyshov, “The Ferial Daily Office of the Great Lavra of St. Sabas (6th–10th century)” (forthcoming).

37 One of very few examples of such reflection is offered by Derek Krueger: “Moreover, Andrew of Crete’s long tenure as metropolitan of Gortyna suggests that the kanon had already become a feature of Morning Prayer in some cathedral contexts” (D. Krueger, *Liturgical Subjects: Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative, and the Formation of the Self in Byzantium* [Philadelphia, 2014], 172).

patriarchate,³⁸ neither of which are monasteries? And fourth, why did the Church of Constantinople provide not an Ecclesiastic but a Hagiopolitan Daily Office for the new Bulgarian church (not only for its monasteries) in the late ninth century?

Still more problems with the standard paradigm will be identified as this article proceeds.

Diversity of Church Segments and Liturgies

Part of the problem of grasping the milieu in which the Hagiopolitan Office was practiced is the need to understand how church contexts and segments differed in Constantinople.³⁹ A structural clue to my interpretations is my reliance on a way of categorizing churches to which scholars of Byzantine liturgy hitherto have not paid sufficient attention: a fundamental distinction between “public” and “private” places of worship.⁴⁰ Even though this categorization was sometimes unclear and varied through time, scholars agree that in its basic sense it remained in force within the Empire.⁴¹

The public churches, termed “catholic” (καθολικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι),⁴² were those dependent on the bishop (in Constantinople, the patriarch) and subject to his

jurisdiction. They were intended for the people and their liturgy was public (δημόσια).⁴³ The patriarchate included the cathedral of Hagia Sophia and two other major churches—Hagia Eirene and the Theotokos church of Chalkoprateia—as well as the smaller churches or chapels of St. Theodore of Sphorakios and St. Peter near (or in) the Great Church. All these patriarchal churches were served by the patriarchal clergy. Added to these were the other catholic or public churches, of which many had the form of basilicas and which were remunerated by the patriarchate but had their own clergy. Apparently, the number of catholic churches was not very high.⁴⁴

The “private” churches were a heterogeneous group that included oratories or house chapels (εὐκτήριον or εὐκτήριος οἶκος), martyria, and the monastery churches. Justinian legislated that unless “catholic” clergy served public liturgy in these churches, those who worshipped there, whether monastics or nonmonastics, were to perform “prayer” (εὐχή) only, but this rule was relaxed over time.⁴⁵ The private churches were not under the direct jurisdiction of the bishop. The imperial churches, too, in principle were recorded among the nonpublic churches, and were “all more or less exempt from patriarchal and episcopal jurisdiction.”⁴⁶ Some churches, like those of patriarchal monasteries,⁴⁷ defy easy categorization, and many “private” churches were no doubt much frequented by the people. Moreover, churches could shift from one status to the other.⁴⁸

38 By “patriarchate” I mean the patriarchal center that included Hagia Sophia and a few other churches; see below.

39 This problem is mentioned, but not discussed, in S. Parenti, “Da Gerusalemme a Costantinopoli passando per Stoudios e Mar Saba: Una liturgia modello per l’Ortodossia,” in *Da Costantinopoli al Caucaso: Imperi e popoli tra Cristianesimo e Islam*, dir. C. Alzati, ed. L. Vaccaro (Vatican City, 2014), 99–120, esp. 102.

40 See J. P. Thomas, *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire* (Washington, DC, 1987), 5–58; G. Dagron, “Constantinople: Les sanctuaires et l’organisation de la vie religieuse,” in *Actes du XI^e congrès international d’archéologie chrétienne: Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève, Aoste, 21–28 septembre 1986*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1989), 2:1069–85, esp. 1080–83; K. Bowes, *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity* (New York, 2008), 103–24. Of course, these terms do not necessarily have the same meaning now as they did then.

41 It is important to note that this is a distinction not of foundation but of ecclesiastical use; many a church was founded by an imperial personage or a private builder but subsequently entrusted to episcopal oversight and use. For instance, both the church of the Theotokos of Chalkoprateia, built by the empresses Pulcheria and Verina, and that of St. Theodore, built by the patrician Sporakios, were “elevated” to the high public status of patriarchal churches (see Thomas, *Private Religious Foundations*, 20–21).

42 See Council of Trullo (692), canon 59 (G. A. Ralles and M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν δεινῶν καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων τῶν τε ἀγίων καὶ πανευφύμων ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν συνόδων, καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀγίων πατέρων* [Athens, 1852], 2:438–39).

43 For this term, see Justinian’s Novella 58 (*CIC Nov.* 3:314.25).

44 According to Emil Herman, “it has been calculated” that the number of such catholic churches in Constantinople in 1437 was only eight (E. Herman, “The Secular Church,” in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. J. M. Hussey [Cambridge, 1967], 4.2:116–25, esp. 118).

45 Justinian, Novella 58; Dagron, “Constantinople,” 1081–82.

46 Paul Magdalino (“Churches, Imperial,” *ODB* 1:457) divides imperial churches in three main types (which I here slightly simplify): 1. the churches and chapels of the imperial palaces, 2. churches founded by emperors in association with the Great Palace (like Nea Ekklesia) or with monastic or philanthropic institutions, and 3. monasteries under the direct protection of the emperor.

47 According to Vincenzo Ruggieri, these seem to have appeared in the ninth century (V. Ruggieri, *Byzantine Religious Architecture (582–867): Its History and Structural Elements*, *OCA* 237 [Rome, 1991], 116).

48 For instance, the main church of the Stoudios monastery, according to the Souda, was originally a catholic church and later changed into a monastery (*Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler [Leipzig, 1935], 438).

The distinction between churches that we find in Byzantine legislation helps us interpret liturgical sources such as the following rubric of the patriarchal Euchologion of Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Coislin 213 of 1027: “This is how the Great Church of God does the office. . . . The other [places of worship]—the catholic [churches], the [oratories] in houses, and the monasteries—each does [it] in its own distinct way.”⁴⁹ In light of the church categorization laid out above, we here recognize four ecclesiastical segments, each with a particular use for the feast to which the rubric refers: the cathedral, the catholic churches (other than the Great Church), the house churches, and the monasteries. Notably, this rubric testifies to a liturgical diversity within the segment of public (catholic) churches, a point that will be important below.

For our purposes, the significance of this categorization of churches lies in the possibility of a correspondence between different liturgical traditions and different church segments or categories. As we will see, the spread of the Hagiopolitan Office maps onto the demarcations of these categories, in a pattern that itself develops. Further, the delineation within public churches themselves between patriarchal and other catholic churches no doubt corresponds to the liturgical distinction within the public church between the Ecclesiastic Daily Office, followed in Hagia Sophia (and probably the other patriarchal churches), and that of (some, most, or all of) the other catholic churches. Since all the catholic churches were under the direct jurisdiction of the patriarch, their liturgy would normally have been determined by him and therefore—as fixed and embraced by the patriarchate—would have had canonical status.

The Hagiopolitan Office in Pre-Iconoclast Constantinople

The main body of this article will present cases of the use of the Hagiopolitan Daily Office in Constantinople at different historical stages and in different social

contexts. The interpretation of these cases will be discussed mainly at its end.

The first two cases are relevant to attacking the difficult question of the beginning and earliest history of the Jerusalem Daily Office tradition in Constantinople.

The Hymnographers Germanos and Andrew

The biographies of hymnographers writing kanons and stichera, especially their connections with the patriarchate or the imperial palace, are significant data for analyzing the Hagiopolitan Office in Constantinople. The ecclesiastical attachment of the hymnographers signals a possible or probable place of performance of their hymns.

Two hymnographers who were active in Constantinople are of high importance for us: St. Germanos I of Constantinople (ca. 655–ca. 740s), patriarch of Constantinople from 715 to 730, and St. Andrew of Crete (ca. 660–740), archbishop of Crete probably from the time of the emperor Philippikos Bardanes (711–713).⁵⁰ We have only sketchy information about their church context in Constantinople prior to becoming bishops. There is no doubt, however, that in their broader networks they belonged to the ecclesiastical elite of Constantinople. Germanos’s father was a *patrikios* (governor or general) of the imperial court, and after having been made a eunuch in his early teens (669), Germanos was enrolled in the clergy of Hagia Sophia,⁵¹ or possibly in the general public clergy.⁵² Since there were age

50 For Germanos’s biography see *PmbZ*, no. 2298, and for Andrew’s see *PmbZ*, no. 362, both with further bibliography.

51 According to the eleventh-century Life of St. Germanos, he was made a cleric of Hagia Sophia, “the Great and Catholic Church” (L. Lamza, *Patriarch Germanos I von Konstantinopel (715–730)* [Würzburg, 1975], 202: κληρικὸν πεποίηκε τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Θεοῦ μεγάλης καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας). Jerusalem Holy Cross 40, too, in its synaxarion entry assigns Germanos to Hagia Sophia: καὶ τῷ κλήρῳ τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας κατέλεξεν (fol. 129v, omitted by Mateos in *Le typicon de la Grande Église* [n. 11 above]). ἁγιωτάτη is another term denoting Hagia Sophia, appearing frequently in the Kanonarion-Synaxarion of the Great Church: ἐν τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

52 According to the synaxarion entry of Patmos Monastery of Saint John the Theologian MS 266: ἐποίησε κληρικὸν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας (Dmitrievsky, *Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopisei*, 1:72). This term may signify the Great Church, consistent with the sources mentioned in the previous note, but it seems also possible that the text of Patmos Monastery of Saint John the Theologian MS 266, which clearly represents an earlier stage of the Kanonarion-Synaxarion, preserves an older reading that may signify the public church in general.

49 Fol. 54v, edited in Dmitrievsky, *Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopisei* (n. 11 above), 2:1001 (Καὶ οὕτω μὲν ποιεῖ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ Μεγάλη Ἐκκλησία τὴν τῶν εὐχῶν τῆς γονυκλισίας τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ἀκολουθίαν, ὡς ἐγράφη. Αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ, καὶ αἱ καθολικαὶ καὶ αἱ κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους καὶ τὰ μοναστήρια, ἄλλῃ ἄλλως ποιεῖ καὶ ἑτέρα ἑτέρως). See a similar interpretation of the passage in Parenti, “The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople” (n. 3 above), 456–59.

requirements for ordinations,⁵³ belonging to “clergy” (Gr. κληρικοί) in such a case no doubt meant a general enrollment in the community of church workers for potential later ordination. Moreover, given Germanos’s later career as a hymnographer he was probably gifted in singing and perhaps as a young man served in a choir; in fact, many of the singers were eunuchs. And given that he became a bishop (of Kyzikos, before 712), before his enthronement he probably belonged to the central church circles from which episcopal candidates were mostly drawn. The emperor Anastasios II appointed Germanos patriarch in 715, which again indicates that his relations with the emperor were excellent.

Andrew, born in Damascus, was in his youth enrolled in the clergy of the Jerusalem cathedral, where he became a monk (Spoudaios?) and held the important role of notary (νοτάριος) of the patriarchate. He arrived in Constantinople from Jerusalem around 685, at about age twenty-five, and after some years in obscurity⁵⁴ the emperor, probably Leontios (695–698), called him to be ordained deacon of Hagia Sophia. Andrew was soon after appointed by the emperor to the positions of *orphannotrophos*, the head of the orphanage, and supervisor of the *diakonia* of Eugenios, a “pious house” (εὐαγῆς οἶκος) of charitable purpose.⁵⁵ He held these two functions until he was elected metropolitan of Crete.

There is no evidence that either Germanos or Andrew participated in organized monasticism; both appear instead to have been “cathedral monastics,” celibate clergy of Hagia Sophia (or possibly the public church at large, in the case of Germanos). At the same time, Andrew devoted himself to work in imperial pious foundations. That the two stayed in close connection with imperial power is confirmed both by their appointment to episcopal sees and by their remarkable changes of theological positions, apparently in response to imperial pressure: in 711 they condemned the Sixth

Ecumenical Council together with the monothelite emperor Philippikos, while in 713 they returned to Dyothelitism with the emperor Anastasios II.

There were four great hymnographers of the seventh- and eighth-century renewal of the Jerusalem hymnal (the New Tropologion): Germanos and Andrew both worked in Constantinople, and the other two, St. John of Damascus (ca. 655–ca. 745) and St. Kosmas of Jerusalem/Maiouma (ca. 675–752/54), worked in Syria and Palestine. Significantly, the hymnography of Germanos and Andrew testifies to an extensive initiative of providing Hagiopolitan hymns for the calendar of Constantinople.⁵⁶ One early source for the biography of Germanos, the short Synaxarion life of Patmos Monastery of Saint John the Theologian MS 266, says that Germanos, “clever and musical, produced Tropologia for all the feasts and to many [or ‘most’] saints.”⁵⁷

What makes hymns ascribed to Germanos particularly valuable is their connection—hitherto not duly recognized—with the old hymnal of Jerusalem, the Old Tropologion, known only in the Georgian version of the Old Iadgari. Stanzas of the Old Tropologion (Old Iadgari) are found, attributed to Germanos, among the heirmos series in Heirmologion manuscripts. Consider one example, which appears in one of the earliest Heirmologion manuscripts, the tenth-century Mount Athos Great Lavra MS B 32:⁵⁸ a series of nine heirmoi for Sunday in mode 3 with the title “Another

53 According to canons 14 and 15 of Trullo, which were formulated after Germanos’s youth, the required ages for ordination to subdiaconate, diaconate, and priesthood were 20, 25, and 30, respectively.

54 The Life of St. Andrew by Niketas says that he lived in silence (ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ), working in his separate cell (ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ σχολάζοντος κελίῳ); no monastery is mentioned (A. Papadopoulos-Kerameos, *Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας*, vol. 5 (Saint Petersburg, 1888), 174).

55 T. S. Miller, *The Orphans of Byzantium: Child Welfare in the Christian Empire* (Washington, DC, 2003), 200–201.

56 An extensive but still incomplete list of hymns attributed to Germanos is found in A. Nikiforova, *Iz istorii Minei v Vizantii: Gimnograficheskie pamiatniki VIII–XII vv. iz sobraniia monastyrja sviatoi Ekateriny na Sinae* [From the history of the Menaion in Byzantium: Hymnographic monuments of the ninth to twelfth centuries from the collection of the Saint Catherine’s Monastery on the Sinai] (Moscow, 2012), 174–80. Manuscript attributions to specific hymnographers are of course not always trustworthy. No one has yet extensively examined the validity of manuscript attributions to Germanos and Andrew.

57 Dmitrievsky, *Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopisei*, 1:72: Εὐφυῆς τε ὦν καὶ ἀσματικὸς ἐποίησε τροπολόγια εἰς τὰ πάντας ἑορτάς καὶ εἰς ἁγίους πλείστους.

58 This manuscript, which abounds in author ascriptions, has been published as a secondary witness by S. Eustratiades, *Εἰρμολόγιον* (Chennevières-sur-Marne, 1932), the primary witness being Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Coislin 220. However, Eustratiades’ “edition” of the two Heirmologia is imprecise and full of errors, and thus cannot be trusted as accurate.

resurrectional office of Patriarch Germanos.”⁵⁹ Here the connection with the Old Iadgari is obvious: five out of nine heirmoi are identical (odes 3 and 4) or almost identical (odes 2, 5, and 9) to stanzas in the Old Iadgari.⁶⁰ In ode 2, the word “exceedingly” (უფრომსად) is removed.⁶¹ In ode 5, the word “Christ” is removed; in ode 9, “through your mother” is replaced by “through the saints.” The thorough examination of four other heirmos series attributed to Germanos has yielded similar results. Even though we have not examined all the hymns attributed to Germanos, these cases enable us to draw a firm conclusion:⁶² these kanon heirmoi attributed to Germanos make extensive use of stanzas of the old hymnal of Jerusalem, the Old Tropologion, by way of either exact copying or (slight) reworking.

Andrew, in contrast, made much less use of the old Jerusalem hymnal for his heirmoi, although his hymnography, too, or at least hymnography attributed to him, was to some degree connected with it.⁶³

The Horologion

The existence of Hagiopolitan hymnographers in the late seventh century in Constantinople corroborates what we may glean from the history of the Horologion.⁶⁴ The Horologion, which—as noted above—originated as the Book of Hours of the Resurrection cathedral, of course came to Constantinople from Palestine. The

evolution of one aspect of the Horologion, the beginning of the cursus, suggests the time when this happened. The cursus of the Jerusalem Horologion initially began with nocturns, as is seen from the Armenian Horologion (*Žamagirk*),⁶⁵ but in about the seventh century the Jerusalem Horologion was reorganized to begin with the first hour of the day.⁶⁶ The matins service begins the cursus in all the Horologion manuscripts of the Constantinople sphere that preserve the full cursus, starting with the tenth-century Sinai Greek New Finds M 46 and the eleventh-century Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Greek 311. Since by that time nocturns and matins had fused, with nocturns coming first in the now combined service called matins, this beginning is in reality the same as that of the pre-reform Jerusalem Horologion. There is also some earlier implicit evidence, such as the listing of daily services at Stoudios in the early ninth century⁶⁷ and the south Italian Horologion of Erlangen Universitätsbibliothek MS A2 (1025), both of which begin with matins.⁶⁸

How might we explain this identity in the beginning of the cursus in early Palestine and in late first-millennium Constantinople? If Constantinople had adapted the Jerusalem Daily Office after the seventh century, we would expect its cursus to begin with the first hour, an order that later would have had to be revised to begin with nocturn-matins. But there is no evidence for a reform of the beginning of the cursus in Constantinople. Rather than speculatively postulating such a change for which there is no evidence, and which would require an explanation, we would take a more reasonable approach in seeing continuity between the early Jerusalem cursus, which began with nocturns,

59 Ἑτέρα ἀκολουθία ἀναστάσιμα Γερμανοῦ Πατριάρχου (Mount Athos Great Lavra MS B 32, fol. 81r).

60 For odes 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9, see E. Metreveli, C. Čankievi, and L. Xevsuriani, eds., *Uzvelesi iadgari* [The oldest Iadgari] (Tbilisi, 1980), 404:13–14, 405:40–42, 406:27–28, 407:28–30, 412:40–42; odes 2, 3, 4, and 9 are translated into French in C. Renoux, *Les hymnes de la résurrection*, vol. 1, *Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne: Textes du Sinaï 18* (Paris, 2000), 183, 186, 188, 199 (ode 5 was not identified by Renoux). I do not discount the possibility that Georgian parallels of more of these heirmoi may be found.

61 Germanos’s first-person singular appears not in the edited text of the Old Iadgari but as a variant of one manuscript (MS D, Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Georgian 41).

62 A quick review of Renoux’s translation of the Old Iadgari and his observations of parallels to heirmoi with author attributions suggests that my conclusion drawn from these few cases is valid more generally.

63 See, e.g., Renoux, *Les hymnes de la résurrection*, 161 (I have verified the author attribution in Mount Athos Great Lavra MS B 32; in Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Coislin 220 there is no attribution), 263 (attribution in both MSS verified).

64 See above, n. 14.

65 See Frøyshov, “The Book of Hours of Armenia and Jerusalem” (n. 2 above).

66 In addition to the two Horologia mentioned in n. 16 above, see the two Sabaitic Horologia of Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Greek MS 863 and Saint Petersburg Russian National Library MS N.S. 16/1, fol. 21v, which both start by the first hour. For more on these, see Frøyshov, “Erlangen University Library A2” (n. 2 above), 206–7.

67 See, e.g., Cathechesis 33 of Theodore’s Great Cathechesis. This catechesis is still unedited, but the list is given in its original Greek in J. Leroy, “Le cursus canonique chez Saint Théodore Studite,” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 68 (1954): 5–19, esp. 13. For more on the Studite daily cursus, see Frøyshov, “Erlangen University Library A2,” 247–48.

68 In my study on this manuscript, whose beginning is incomplete, I conclude that it originally started with matins (Frøyshov, “Erlangen University Library A2,” 229–32).

and the Constantinopolitan cursus, which began with matins (nocturns-matins). We can then deduce that the particular Horologion redaction adopted in Constantinople preceded the rearrangement in Palestine of the daily cursus to begin with the first hour. As shown below, this is one of the arguments for my view that Constantinople received the Horologion from Jerusalem at an early date—before the second half of the seventh century.

The Hagiopolitan Office at the Imperial Court, Eighth to Tenth Century

The next chronological concern pertains to the composition and performance of Hagiopolitan hymnography and offices at the imperial court. We must start by clarifying the type of churches situated at the court.

Churches at the Great Palace—Their Status and Liturgy: The Case of Great (Good) Friday

The Great Palace of Constantinople, the administrative and cultural center of the Empire, was the residence of the emperor and his family, as well as of a considerable entourage. It was also the place of work, ceremony, and pleasure for the imperial court, which consisted of a large number of officials, dignitaries, and staff;⁶⁹ though some lived inside the Great Palace, most lived near it. Further, the Great Palace's thirty churches and chapels made it an important arena of liturgical life. In an earlier period, the main palatine church was that of St. Stephen, situated at the upper, older part of the palace, but it was gradually replaced by the Theotokos church of the Pharos in the lower part. Another important palatine church, in the upper part, was that of the Lord (τοῦ Κυρίου).⁷⁰ In addition, there

were imperial churches in immediate proximity to the Great Palace, such as SS. Sergios and Bakchos, and many churches of imperial foundation that retained their close connection with the court, like that of Holy Apostles.⁷¹ The Nea Ekklesia,⁷² dedicated in 880, had an ambiguous status; as Paul Magdalino has argued, it was properly speaking neither a palatine church nor a private one.⁷³ Gilbert Dagron points out that by its full title, "the New Great Church"—which was given by the founder, Basil I, and was the one most often used by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos—it was "defined . . . in relation to St Sophia, the old Great Church."⁷⁴ The Nea Ekklesia seems to have played an important liturgical role, since its office could serve as a model for that of other churches.⁷⁵

The Great Palace of course had a close connection with the patriarchate and its cathedral of Hagia Sophia. Was the Daily Office of its churches therefore the Ecclesiastic Office? There is a passage in *The Book of Ceremonies* that could seem to imply that the Daily Office of the Pharos church was the Ecclesiastic Office: on Great (Good) Friday, we read, the emperor and his entourage, returning from Blachernae, "participate in the office of terce-sext (τριτοέκτη) and he makes obeisance before the precious lance."⁷⁶ The *tritoekti* service was an eminent mark of the Ecclesiastic Office, since in this period the Hagiopolitan tradition for this day had

69 Estimated by scholars as 1000–2000; see A. P. Kazhdan and M. McCormick, "The Social World of the Byzantine Court," in *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. H. Maguire (Washington, DC, 1997), 167–97.

70 On these churches of the Great Palace, see R. Janin, *Les églises et les monastères*, vol. 3 of *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique*, part 1 of *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin* (Paris, 1969), 473–74 (Stephen), 232–36 (Pharos), 511–12 (τοῦ Κυρίου); P. Magdalino, "L'église du Phare et les reliques de la Passion à Constantinople," in *Byzance et les reliques du Christ*, ed. J. Durand and B. Flusin (Paris, 2004), 15–30, esp. 19; A. Lidov, "A Byzantine Jerusalem: The Imperial Pharos as the Holy Sepulchre," in *Jerusalem as Narrative Space*, ed. A. Hoffmann and G. Wolf (Leiden, 2012), 63–103.

71 Janin, *Les églises et les monastères*, 451–54 (Sergios and Bakchos), 41–50 (Apostles).

72 Janin, *Les églises et les monastères*, 361–64.

73 P. Magdalino, "Observations on the Nea Ekklesia of Basil I," *JÖB* 37.1 (1987): 51–64, esp. 61–63.

74 G. Dagron, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, trans. J. Birrell (Cambridge, 2003), 212.

75 The imperial Pantokrator monastery's Typikon (1136) established that in the Theotokos Eleousa church, which was a semipublic church despite being located in the monastery complex, "they should sing the office (*akolouthia*) of the *Hagiopolites* in the *typos* that is used in the great church in the palace" (P. Gautier, "Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantokrator," *REB* 32 [1974]: 1–145, esp. 77). I agree with Paul Magdalino ("The Foundation of the Pantokrator Monastery in Its Urban Setting," in *The Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople*, ed. S. Kotzabassi [Boston, 2013], 33–55, esp. 43, n. 53) that the Μεγάλη ἐκκλησία in question is no doubt the Nea, which enjoyed the formal appellation of "Great Church" and was conceived as being in the palace (even though modern scholars might argue that strictly speaking it was not in the palace).

76 Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *The Book of Ceremonies* 1.34, trans. A. Moffatt and M. Tall (Canberra, 2012), 179.

separate hours (first, third, sixth, and ninth hours).⁷⁷ The question is where this tritoekti service was celebrated, in the patriarchate or at the Great Palace. Since *The Book of Ceremonies* indicates no specific church, one might infer that it was any one at the court—perhaps the Theotokos Pharos, since it is the church where the emperor would venerate the holy lance if he returned from Blachernae after tritoekti.⁷⁸ However, further investigation shows this conjecture to be quite unlikely.

According to the main manuscript of the Kanonarion-Synaxarion of the Great Church, Jerusalem Greek Orthodox Patriarchate MS Holy Cross 40, the lance was placed for veneration in Hagia Sophia from Great Thursday until the sixth hour of Great Friday, at which hour it was “returned to the palace by the *referendarios*.”⁷⁹ It is not said at which hour tritoekti started, but the removal of the lance must have taken place after it, since the troparion of the lance is sung during the service. I find it unlikely that the same tritoekti service was celebrated at the Great Palace after the lance had been brought there, because that would require the lance to be taken from one tritoekti service to another, with the latter service starting too late to be properly connected to the third hour. The emperor would scarcely have accepted at the palace such a secondary duplicate celebration performed at a wrong hour. In addition, another tritoekti service attested in *The Book of Ceremonies*, that of the first day of Lent, is explicitly said to have been celebrated at the Great Church: “at the conclusion of the office of terce-sexst, go away from there, that is, from Hagia Sophia.”⁸⁰ It thus appears clear that the tritoekti of Great Friday took

place in Hagia Sophia and provides no evidence regarding the Ecclesiastic Office at the Great Palace.⁸¹

Indeed, as already noted, imperial churches—and the palatine churches were imperial par excellence—were categorized as “private,” not public, and so were outside direct patriarchal jurisdiction. Further, during the period in question it seems that the emperor worshipped mostly in palatine churches, attending services sometimes at other churches but only rarely at Hagia Sophia;⁸² the tritoekti service for the lance is one such rare instance. If strictly applied to these private palatine churches, Justinian’s Novella 58 would even imply that their liturgy was *not* normally the public Ecclesiastic Office, but obviously this is not true: the imperial clergy frequently celebrated the Divine Liturgy, which was a public service. However, the status of palatine churches as private and the relative independence of their clergy in relation to the patriarchate no doubt made it possible for the Great Palace to assimilate Hagiopolitan liturgy more easily than could the patriarchate.

Matins at the Churches of St. Stephen and the Theotokos Pharos

First-millennium sources point to the use of the Hagiopolitan Daily Office, full or partial, in the Theotokos Pharos. *The Book of Ceremonies*, in a section composed during the time of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (r. 913–956)⁸³ and concerned with the three relics of the True Cross, provides evidence that the Daily Office of the two most important palatine churches, St. Stephen and the Theotokos Pharos, at this time included the hymnographical kanon.⁸⁴ When the True Cross was paraded in the palace and the city from 1 to 13 August, it went out from St. Stephen, where the third and sixth

77 As seen in early Triodia like Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Greek MS 735–736 (tenth century) and Vatican Biblioteca Apostolica Vatican Greek MS 771 (eleventh century). The earlier Jerusalem tradition had other services.

78 Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *The Book of Ceremonies* 1.34 (179–80).

79 Mateos, *Le typicon de la Grande Église* (n. 11 above), 2:78. The troparion explicitly says “We venerate the lance.” The more ancient witness, Patmos Monastery of Saint John the Theologian MS 266, does not mention the Holy Lance for Great Thursday and Friday. However, this should be interpreted not as an earlier practice, implying that the veneration of the lance would have taken place in the palace only, but as a part of this witness’s omission of a number of topographical and liturgical details pertaining to Hagia Sophia and Constantinople (Mateos, *Le typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:ix).

80 Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *The Book of Ceremonies* 2.10 (548).

81 Later, it seems, this service was moved to Hagia Eirene; see Janeras, *Le Vendredi-Saint* (n. 13 above), 309–11.

82 Michael Featherstone remarks that “the evidence of the Typikon would suggest that before the Macedonian recodification of ceremonial the emperor had ceased going to St Sophia altogether, except on the feasts of Easter and Christmas” (M. Featherstone, “Space and Ceremony in the Great Palace of Constantinople under the Macedonian Dynasty,” in *Le corti nell’alto Medioevo* [Spoleto, 2015], 587–608, esp. 604).

83 M. McCormick, “*De ceremoniis*,” *ODB* 1:596.

84 The Nea Ekklesia is also included in this passage, but, as I have noted above, this church was not strictly speaking a church of the Great Palace.

odes were sung at matins. The third and sixth odes necessarily belong to the series of nine hymnographical odes of the kanon. Two weeks later the cross would be brought back:

Then [on 13 August] is [the Holy Cross] put away in the Chapel of St Theodore, and in the evening the *papias* and the deputy carry it to the Church of the Theotokos of the Pharos, and hand it over to the sacristan. Early in the morning, when the morning service is singing the third or sixth ode, after it has been wiped by both the protopapas and the sacristan, it is put away in the sacred sacristy.⁸⁵

The death of Emperor Leo V in 820, as it is described in several historiographical reports, contains liturgical information of interest for us. The *Acta of David, Symeon and George* (BHG 494), written by the 870s and taking place mostly in Mytilene on the island of Lesbos, has it that Leo was killed in the church of St. Stephen during the twelve-day festal period between Nativity and Theophany (ἐν τῇ δωδεκαήμερῳ).⁸⁶ But this source, which for “much of what is recorded about Constantinople in the years 815–842 deviates from what is documented elsewhere,”⁸⁷ is contradicted by the other narratives, even in the details of Leo’s death. The slightly later *Life of Ignatios* (the patriarch) by Niketas David the Paphlagonian, written at the end of the ninth century or the beginning of the tenth, places the murder in the Theotokos church of Pharos.⁸⁸ Two documents that were probably edited under Constantine VII—namely, the first part of Theophanes Continuatus and the chronicle attributed to Joseph Genesios⁸⁹—agree

with Niketas David in placing the murder of Leo in the Pharos church and give its time more specifically as matins of the Nativity of Christ. Without rejecting the possibility that the *Acta of David, Symeon and George* might be correct, it seems reasonable to trust the majority of sources, which also derive from central circles of the capital. Genesios says that Leo occasionally led the choir in the Pharos church and liked singing, particularly a stanza that concerned a monarch: “For the King of all, longing held fast the Children, who despised as nought the base ungodly babblings of the tyrant who raged with fury insensate[.]”⁹⁰ This is the heirmos for the iambic kanon of the Nativity of Christ attributed to John of Damascus. Theophanes Continuatus calls this stanza “his [i.e., the emperor’s] beloved,”⁹¹ a characterization that invites us to interpret this detail not as a vicious posthumous allegation that the emperor ironically acknowledged his opposition but as a display of his satisfaction with singing about a tyrant whom the innocent young men in the furnace of Babylon rightly opposed. Taking into account other factors as well,⁹² we may consider the account of the Hagiopolitan singing of Leo V to be historically reliable, which means that Hagiopolitan hymnography was sung in the Pharos church at the beginning of the ninth century.

Drawing such conclusions from the data about Leo’s death is supported by what Theophanes Continuatus relates about another emperor who was slightly later, Theophilos (r. 829–842). According to Theophanes, Theophilos composed music and text within Hagiopolitan genres; specifically, he changed the music or rhythm (or both) of the refrain Εὐλογεῖτε,

85 Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *The Book of Ceremonies* 2.8 (540).

86 J. van den Gheyn, “Acta graeca ss. Davidis, Symeonis et Georgii Mitylenae in insula Lesbo,” *AB* 18 (1899): 209–59, esp. 229.

87 S. Efthymiadis, “Hagiography from the ‘Dark Age’ to the Age of Symeon Metaphrastes (Eighth–Tenth Centuries),” in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*, vol. 1, *Periods and Places*, ed. S. Efthymiadis (Farnham, 2011), 95–142, esp. 112.

88 Nicetas David, *The Life of Patriarch Ignatius*, ed. and trans. A. Smithies, notes by J. M. Duffy (Washington, DC, 2013), 10. On its dating, see Efthymiadis, “Hagiography from the ‘Dark Age’ to the Age of Symeon Metaphrastes,” 116.

89 Theophanes Continuatus 1.25, in *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur libri I–IV*, ed. and trans. J. M.

Featherstone and J. Signes-Codoñer, CFHB 53 (Berlin, 2015), 60–62; Ioseph Genesios 1.16, in *Iosephi Genesii regum libri quattuor*, ed. A. Lesmüller-Werner and H. Thurn, CFHB 14, Series Berolinensis (Berlin, 1973), 14–15 (about Leo’s singing of the Nativity kanon).

90 *The Menaion*, trans. the Holy Transfiguration Monastery, vol. 4, *The Month of December* (Boston, 2005), 221.

91 Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographiae* 1.25 (trans. 61).

92 Given what seems clear recognition of the difference between the Ecclesiastic and Hagiopolitan Offices at the time, as we see in several liturgical manuscripts that specify the one or the other (e.g., Psalters), it seems quite improbable that the ritual circumstances of Leo’s assassination were invented a century after the fact. Further, one of the two sources claims that Leo had a bad voice and the other that he was a good singer (see Ioseph Genesios, *On the Reigns of the Emperors*, ed. and trans. A. Kaldellis [Canberra, 1998], 18, n. 78), and such a discrepancy suggests that the story was old: if it had been of recent invention, the sources likely would have been more coherent.

“Bless,”⁹³ of ode 8 of the Annunciation kanon and “commanded that it should be sung to the hearing of all in the church of God.”⁹⁴ Further, Theophanes informs us, “they say” that Theophilus wrote a sticheron for Palm Sunday. The details of this account are striking, and there is no reason why someone would retrospectively invent such favorable information about an Iconoclast emperor. Because no particular church is mentioned, we must deduce where Theophilus would have had his music and hymns performed. Since Hagia Sophia was at this time purely Ecclesiastic and since, as noted above, the emperor was at that time attending churches mostly at the Great Palace, the palace churches, such as those of Pharos and of St. Stephen, are probable locations. Further, Theophanes depicts the emperor as eager that his eminent musical talent be spread to “the church of God” so that all might hear it, which sounds like the intended venue was many churches and not just some palatine one(s). In other words, Theophanes’ music and hymns for Hagiopolitan hymnography would have been used both at the Great Palace and in many churches of Constantinople.

Were the kanons performed in the churches of Pharos and St. Stephen in the early ninth and tenth centuries sung in full Hagiopolitan matins,⁹⁵ or in a “Hagiopolitanized” Ecclesiastic Office? The full discussion of this question appears later in this article, but the short answer is that Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic services seem to have arisen in patriarchal circles in the ninth century and that the Pharos church, the church of St. Stephen, and no doubt other churches of the Great Palace most likely were observing the full Hagiopolitan Office by the beginning of the ninth century.

Hagiopolitan Hymnographers of the Imperial Court

Hymnography provides the richest evidence for the Hagiopolitan liturgy within the imperial court. Besides identifying the best-known and most productive hymnographers, the source material reveals the names and in most cases biographical elements of a whole series

of minor hymnographers attached in some way to the Great Palace and writing in Hagiopolitan genres (kanons and stichera).

In which churches were their hymns sung? Does it necessarily follow from the authors’ being courtiers that the hymns were performed in palatine churches and chapels? As noted above, most of them actually lived outside the Great Palace. *The Book of Ceremonies* describes the participation of a large number of courtiers in connection with certain church celebrations, most of them at palatine ceremonies outside the churches, but some courtiers accompanied the emperor into the churches.⁹⁶ It seems reasonable at this point to assume that the hymns of court hymnographers were sung primarily in palatine churches, first among them the Pharos church; possibly also in imperial churches closely connected with the Great Palace, like the Nea Ekklesia; and in other churches in Constantinople. Secondarily, these hymns could have reached churches outside the Great Palace.

Most of the court hymnographers were actually laypeople, and four were even emperors; some of them at a later stage became clergymen—at least seven of them patriarchs. Here space permits only a chronological list of hymnographers with short biographies and, if the author is little known, hymnographical references. Many of these hymnographers are known from one or two early Heirmologia (abbr. *Heirm.* below)⁹⁷ and from later Sticheria (abbr. *StichAmbros.*);⁹⁸ the presence in these liturgical documents of the hymns of so many authors attached to the imperial court in itself suggests that they originated in the same milieu.⁹⁹

96 For instance, at Palm Sunday: “The emperor goes away with the kouboukleion and the priests into the Church of the Most Holy Theotokos at the Pharos, and the patricians, after praying with the emperor, go out. Then, if the emperor wishes, the patricians are summoned and they participate in the liturgy with the emperor in the Church of the Most Holy Theotokos, but if not, they participate in the liturgy outside in the Church of St Stephen of the Hippodrome” (Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *The Book of Ceremonies* 1.32 [175]).

97 Edited in Eustratiades, *Εἰρμολόγιον* (n. 58 above). Because of the inaccuracies in this edition, I have checked it against microfilms of the manuscripts.

98 L. Perria and J. Raasted, eds., *Sticherarium Ambrosianum*, Pars Principales and Pars Suppletoria (Copenhagen, 1992). The Stichera of Milan Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS A 139 suppl. of 1341 is here published in photographs; see especially the “Index of ascriptions” to hymnographers in Pars Suppl., 57–58.

99 When no reference is given, I refer the reader to general overviews of Byzantine hymnographers. See the bibliography in Frøyshov,

93 Theophanes gives only the first word, but there can be no doubt that he refers to the last phrase of each troparion of the eighth ode (which begins Ἀκουε Κόρη): Εὐλογεῖτε, πάντα τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου τὸν Κύριον.

94 Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographiae* 3.16 (trans. 154).

95 By “full Hagiopolitan Office” I mean a Hagiopolitan Office that has the Horologion, the Psalter, and the hymnography.

Tarasios (*PmbZ*, no. 7235, ca. 730–806, patriarch 784–806), the son of a *patrikios* and *quaestor* (high-ranking judge), was himself *asekretis* (secretary of the imperial chancery) or *protasekretis* (first secretary), “described as a highly cultivated man, proficient in the ancient poetic metres.”¹⁰⁰ A Lenten kanon, in manuscripts placed on the second Sunday of Great Lent, has an acrostic ending in “Tarasios”;¹⁰¹ four stichera, two of which concern icons, are attributed to “Tarasios Patriarch” (*StichAmbros.*).¹⁰²

Kosmas Vestitor (*PmbZ*, no. 4125, mid-eighth century [Wenger], 730–850 [Beck]) was a courtier to whom five encomia on the translation (in 438) of the relics of St. John Chrysostom are attributed.¹⁰³ Two stichera for the same occasion (*StichAmbros.*) and an alphabetic kanon on the Conception of Mary are also attributed to him.¹⁰⁴

Theodore the Studite (*PmbZ*, no. 7574, 759–826) and Joseph of Thessalonike (*PmbZ*, no. 3448, 762–832) were brothers from a prominent family serving in imperial finances: their father held the office of *basilikos sakellarios* (emperor’s fiscal official). Before the whole family in 781 retired to the monastery of Sakkoudion in Bithynia, the brothers received a solid education in Constantinople. In 798 Theodore and

Joseph moved to Studios, which seems to have had a dual status as imperial and private monastery.¹⁰⁵

Michael I Rhangabes (*PmbZ*, no. 4989, ca. 770–844, r. 811–813), the son of a *patrikios*, was married to the daughter of the emperor Nikephoros I. He became emperor, then monk after his abdication. A kanon for Pascha has the acrostic Μιχαὴλ Ἀναξ in the theotokia,¹⁰⁶ pointing to the emperor Michael I as author.¹⁰⁷

Methodios I (*PmbZ*, no. 4977, before 785–847, patriarch 843–847), born on Sicily of influential Greek parents, came early to Constantinople to continue his education but became monk and hegumen in Bithynia. A friend and archdeacon of Patriarch Nikephoros I (806–815), he gained an important role at the court of Emperor Theophilos and was a considerable Hagiopolitan hymnographer.

Ignatios I (*PmbZ*, no. 2666/22712, 798/99–877, patriarch 847–58, 867–77), the son of Emperor Michael I, was castrated and made a monk at age fourteen. He founded four monasteries and is well-known as Hagiopolitan hymnographer.

Theophilos (*PmbZ*, no. 8167, ca. 800/805–842, r. 829–842) was an Iconoclast who, according to Theophanes Continuatus, composed music to Hagiopolitan hymns (stichera and kanons) and wrote a sticheron for Palm Sunday.¹⁰⁸

Sergios Logothetes (*PmbZ*, no. 6678, perhaps identical with *PmbZ*, no. 6664 and/or 6672; ninth

“Greek Hymnody” (n. 23 above). C. Emereau, “Hymnographi byzantini,” *EO* 21 (1922): 258–79; 22 (1923): 11–25, 419–39; 23 (1924): 195–200, 275–85, 407–14; 24 (1925): 163–79; 25 (1926): 177–84, is probably the most accessible of these overviews.

100 C. Mango, “The Revival of Learning,” in *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, ed. idem (Oxford, 2002), 214–29, esp. 215.

101 Already in the first troparion the terms εἰκὼν and ἀρχέτυπος appear (Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Greek MS 737, fol. 145v), suitable for a hymnographer who was patriarch at the first victory of the icons. For a short mention of this kanon and its early witnesses, see G. Bertonière, *The Sundays of Lent in the Triodion: The Sundays without a Commemoration*, OCA 253 (Rome, 1997), 80–83, 94, 175. The kanon attributed to him for 25 May (Emereau, “Hymnographi byzantini,” *EO* 24 [1925]: 176) is not genuine.

102 The last two of the four stichera, also concerning icons, are attributed to Tarasios by other Sticheria as well (see I. Karabinov, *Postnaia Triod’* [Lenten Triodion] (Saint Petersburg, 1910), 121–22).

103 *CPG* 8142–46. He was *vestitor*, responsible for dressing the emperor.

104 If the kanon on the Conception of the Theotokos attributed to him (PG 106:1013–17) is authentic, it suggests a ninth-century date for Kosmas, since the feast seems to have originated in that century.

105 P. Hatlie, *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople, ca. 350–850* (Cambridge, 2007), 336–38.

106 The Triodion of Vatican Greek 771 (eleventh century), fols. 197r–199r. Published in *Πεντηχοστάριον*, ed. P. Vitali (Rome, 1738), 316(τιστ)–320(τκ). Incipit: Σήμερον ἀγγέλων στρατιαὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς.

107 The term ἀναξ is a royal epithet. Francisco García Bóveda, after analyzing possible candidates, concludes that this hymnographer is Michael I (F. J. García Bóveda, “Πάθος και Ανάστασις ιστορική εξέλιξη της βυζαντινῆς ἡμνογραφίας της Μεγάλης Εβδομάδας και της Εβδομάδας της Διακαινησίμου” [PhD diss., Aristotle University of Thessalonica, 2007], 429–33). Vitali (*Πεντηχοστάριον*, 217[τιζ]) gives the following title: Εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πάσχα, ποίημα Μιχαὴλ Ἀνακτος τοῦ μετέπειτα μοναχοῦ. I do not know Vitali’s source for the biographical addition “τοῦ μετέπειτα μοναχοῦ,” which is not in the manuscript.

108 Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographiae* 3.16 (trans. 154). This sticheron is included in the received Triodion, without attribution.

century) was a high official, and one sticheron for Great Friday is attributed to him (*StichAmbros.*).¹⁰⁹

Photios I (*PmbZ*, no. 6253, 810/20–after 894, patriarch 858–67, 877–86) came from an influential family and was *protasekretis* and a leading erudite before his enthronement as patriarch.¹¹⁰

Theophanes Protothronos, Choirinos (*PmbZ*, no. 28088, ninth century, *protothronos*¹¹¹ 880–86) was deacon and *protonotarios* before becoming metropolitan. To him are attributed a kanon (*Heirm.*) and three stichera (*StichAmbros.*), one for the Dormition and two for Great Friday. The possibility should not be excluded that some of the hymns attributed in the received tradition to “Theophanes” belong to him rather than to Theophanes Graptos.

Christopher Protasekretis (probably *PmbZ*, no. 21257, last half of the ninth century) is the author assigned to the kanon for Cheese-fare Sunday found in the received Triodion.¹¹²

In the late ninth and tenth century we find the following Hagiopolitan hymnographers connected with the court: Constantine Kephala (*PmbZ*, no. 23790 and/or 23824, late ninth or early tenth century), lay teacher at the school of the Nea Ekklesia and/or Protopapas of the Great Palace, to whom a kanon for the falling asleep of St. John Chrysostom is attributed;¹¹³ Emperor Leo VI the Wise (886–912); Euthymios (patriarch 907–12), a pupil of Patriarch Ignatios, a monk, and someone close to Emperor Leo VI; Nicholas Mystikos (patriarch 901–07, 912–25), who seems to have studied in court circles and, despite his monastic tonsure, became the *mystikos* (private

secretary) of Emperor Leo VI; Leo Maistor, possibly identical to Leo Choirosphaktes (*PmbZ*, no. 24343, d. after 920); Anastasios Quaestor (*PmbZ*, no. 20297, d. after 922), one of the most important lay hymnographers of the palace; and Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (913–956). Finally, four stichera for the Annunciation are attributed to Theodore Protospatharios (*StichAmbros.*); his dates are unknown.¹¹⁴

This impressive list of hymnographers, both well-known and obscure, demonstrates that the imperial court was a major arena of Hagiopolitan hymn writing from the eighth to the tenth centuries.

The Hagiopolitan Office in the Public Church of Post-Iconoclastic Constantinople

Three cases show the use of the Hagiopolitan Office in the public church of the ninth and tenth centuries: the ninth-century Byzantine mission to the Bulgars, a Psalter codex that probably originated in a patriarchal milieu, and the presence of Hagiopolitan hymnographers in the patriarchate. The Bulgarian evidence is crucial to our understanding of the post-Iconoclastic situation.

The Hagiopolitan Office in the Bulgarian Church

When Boris, prince of Bulgaria, was baptized into the Byzantine Church in 865/66 with Emperor Michael III as his godfather, the Bulgarian Church did not yet formally exist, but Boris “allowed members of the Byzantine clergy to enter Bulgaria and begin their missionary work.”¹¹⁵ Some of these clergymen were (Greek) bishops who would participate at the council in Constantinople of 869–70.¹¹⁶ This council established the Bulgarian Church, giving it the status of an autonomous church with its own archbishop, appointed by the patriarch of Constantinople (then Ignatios) and placed under his jurisdiction.

We may therefore logically assume that the new Bulgarian Church received the necessary liturgical books from its source—the ecclesiastical (i.e.,

109 Incipit: Φοβερὸν καὶ παράδοξον μυστήριον σήμερον ἐνεργούμενον (fol. 242v). As *logothetes*, he headed a department of the Byzantine state.

110 For a recent, full review of Photios’s hymnographical authorship, see S. Tessari, *Il corpus innografico attribuito a Fozio: Edizione critica e analisi musicale* (Torino, 2014).

111 The *protothronos* was the metropolitan of Caesarea and the second highest ranking bishop of the patriarchate of Constantinople.

112 Emereau, “Hymnographi byzantini,” *EO* 22 (1923): 17; see Krueger, *Liturgical Subjects* (n. 37 above), 186–91, for questions of manuscript sources and the identity of the author, as well as a study of the kanon.

113 E. Papaēliopoulos-Phōtopoulos, *Ταμείον ἀνέκδοτων βυζαντινῶν ἁσματικῶν κανόνων*, vol. 1, *Κανόνες μεγαλίων* (Athens, 1996), 45.

114 There are many individuals named Theodore Protospatharios in *PmbZ*, but none of them is described as an author.

115 F. Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 500–1250* (Cambridge, 2006), 168.

116 C. Hannick, “Les nouvelles chrétientés du monde byzantin: Russes, Bulgares et Serbes,” in *Évêques, moines et empereurs (610–1054)*, ed. G. Dagron et al., *Histoire du christianisme des origines à nos jours* 4 (Paris, 1993), 909–39, esp. 928.

patriarchal) authorities of Constantinople.¹¹⁷ In these initial years of the Bulgarian Church, both the liturgical language and the clergy were Greek. The ecclesiastical seat was located at first in Pliska, where the cathedral, the “Great Basilica,” was soon constructed, as well as an episcopal palace with a scriptorium.¹¹⁸ Prince Boris early saw the need for the worship and literature of the new church to be in the native tongue, and in 886 he received some of the disciples of Cyril and Methodios who would continue their work of translating ecclesiastical texts from Greek into Slavonic.¹¹⁹ An assembly in 893 moved the capital and church center to Preslav, made Christianity the state religion, and proclaimed Slavonic to be the official language of the church. Native literary activity, which included new compositions in Slavonic, took place at two major “literary schools,” at Pliska/Preslav and at Ohrid. Among the most prominent literati were St. Clement of Ohrid, St. Naum of Ohrid/Preslav, and Constantine of Preslav. All three composed hymns within the Hagiopolitan genres (kanons and stichera) in their native tongue. Constantine, who became bishop of Preslav in 893, composed kanons whose acrostics revealed the author’s name.

Which tradition for the Daily Office did the Bulgarian church receive from the Church of Constantinople—the Ecclesiastic or the Hagiopolitan? Proof for the claim that it was the Ecclesiastic Office would be a Slavonic translation of the Kanonarion-Synaxarion of the Great Church and of the Ecclesiastic Psalter, but

no such documents are known to have existed. On the contrary, the preserved corpus of early Slavonic liturgy provides overwhelming evidence that the Hagiopolitan Office was the early Bulgarian Daily Office. Alexis Pentkovsky, who recently reviewed the evidence, book by book, has reached the following conclusion—using the cathedral-monastic terminology in which *monastic* here signifies the Hagiopolitan Office: “The Slavonic liturgy of the Byzantine rite was from the beginning monastic, which is shown by the distribution of Gospel pericopes, the choice of translated and original Slavonic hymnographical texts in use, as well as the structure of the services of the Daily Office in which these texts were used.”¹²⁰

Concretely, this means that the hymn books of the early Bulgarian Church were the Menaion, the Triodion, and the Oktoechos. The efforts to translate the Greek hymnals were successful; the complete set of Hagiopolitan hymnographical books was translated no later than the reign of Tsar Simeon (893–927).¹²¹ Points of circumstantial evidence demonstrating a close connection between Hagiopolitan liturgy and early Bulgarian church authorities are that Hagiopolitan liturgical books were translated at the cathedral scriptorium of Pliska, later at that of Preslav, and that one of the Hagiopolitan hymnographers, Constantine, was bishop of the same city. Presumably Constantine, working at the cathedral scriptorium, wrote these hymns for use in the cathedral (and possibly also for monasteries, but hardly for monasteries only). The earliest source of the Slavonic Horologion is the Glagolitic fragment Sinai New Finds Slavonic Fragment 1,¹²² datable to the first half of the eleventh century. Also from the

117 In several recent articles, Alexis Pentkovsky has repeatedly reached the conclusion that the early Russian liturgical books, received from Bulgaria (Ohrid), were of non-Constantinopolitan character: see A. Pentkovsky, “Slavianskoe bogoslužhenie vizantiiskogo obriada i korpus slavianskikh bogoslužebnykh knig v kontse IX—pervoï polovine X vekov [The Slavic Liturgy of the Byzantine Rite and the corpus of Slavic liturgical books at the end of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th centuries],” *Slověne* 5.2 (2016): 54–120, with reference on pp. 108–9 to his other articles dealing with this topic. Although his claim seems contrary to my assumption that the Bulgarian liturgical books (i.e., their Greek model) were received from Constantinople, it rests on questionable suppositions about what “Constantinopolitan” means. In my view, too little research has been done on that subject; one aim of this article is to change the common notion about what liturgy was present in Constantinople. Further, non-Constantinopolitan elements in Bulgarian and later Russian liturgical books may have entered after the Greek books had arrived from Constantinople. For our purposes here, we can assume that Bulgaria initially received liturgical books directly from Constantinople.

118 Curta, *Southeastern Europe*, 174.

119 Ibid.

120 Pentkovsky, “The Slavic Liturgy of the Byzantine Rite,” 56–71.

121 M. Yovcheva and L. Taseva, “Translated Literature in Bulgarian Middle Ages as a Social and Cultural Phenomenon,” *Scripta & e-Scripta* 10–11 (2012): 271–323. They note that the period from 886 to 893 was “probably . . . when the translation and compiling of the main liturgical books of the Orthodox rite started as well: the hymnographic collections Octoechos, Menaion, Triodion and Pentecostarion” (280). Further, during the reign of Tsar Simeon were produced “the complete translations of a number of biblical books as well as the subsequently added biblical commentaries, hymnographic and homiletic repertorium for the celebration of the major saints” (281–82). For example, “As evidenced by the Greek Vita of St Clement of Okhrid, the Pentecostarion [hymnal] was translated by Clement at the end of his life” (280, n. 58; Clement died in 916).

122 N. Glibetić, “A New 11th Century Glagolitic Fragment from St Catherine’s Monastery: The Midnight Prayer of Early Slavic

eleventh century is an outline of vespers found in the eleventh-century Glagolitic Psalter of Sinai Slavonic 38 + 2/N.¹²³ Admittedly, these two incomplete witnesses to the early Slavonic version of the Hagiopolitan Horologion are not from the earliest period, but we can posit that the first Bulgarian translators also translated the Horologion because it was a necessary liturgical book, providing the ritual framework for the performance of the hymns whose translations we do possess.

The Hagiopolitan Office in a Bi-ritual Psalter

Moscow State Historical Museum MS Khludov 129d, the famous Khludov (or Chludov) Psalter—one of the three ninth-century marginal Psalters¹²⁴—is interesting for our purposes. Both the Khludov Psalter and one of the other two, the Mount Athos Pantokrator Monastery MS 61 (the Pantokrator Psalter), have the Ecclesiastic stichometry¹²⁵ and rubrics, including references to Ecclesiastic services and stichology (variable psalmody). In addition, the Khludov Psalter possesses rubrics for Hagiopolitan stichology: KAΘ(ΙΣΜΑ) to denote the twenty larger psalm units and ΔΟΞΑ to denote the sixty smaller ones. The Ecclesiastic features in this Psalter are more dominant than its Hagiopolitan features.¹²⁶ What does the double liturgical system and its internal emphases tell us about the ecclesiastical milieu in which the Khludov Psalter was composed and used?

Some scholars, most recently Irina Lozovaya and Boris Fonkich, have located its origin in the monastery of Stoudios.¹²⁷ Their interpretation explains the presence of the Hagiopolitan rubrics but not the Ecclesiastic features, since Stoudios practiced the Hagiopolitan Daily Office. Why would Studite monks

have used a foreign stichometry and included the rubrics of a liturgical system that they did not use?¹²⁸ Certainly, the priority given by the Khludov Psalter to Ecclesiastic stichometry and rubrics points to circles in which the Ecclesiastic Office was primary but the Hagiopolitan Office was also in use. Since particular churches usually follow only one liturgical tradition, the double system in the Khludov Psalter seems to point to a more inclusive milieu that was able to combine both.

Recently, Maria Evangelatou has undertaken a thorough examination of the liturgical and artistic aspects of the Khludov Psalter, emphasizing that the primary visual references are patriarchal rather than monastic. She concludes that “the makers and users of the Khludov Psalter were related to the patriarchate.”¹²⁹ Scholars have proposed that the Khludov Psalter may have been produced by the circles of the mid-ninth-century patriarchs Methodios (843–47) or Photios (858–67, 877–86).¹³⁰ Indeed, the patriarchate may very well have been the inclusive milieu that combined the two Daily Office traditions.

Ninth- to Tenth-Century Patriarchs and Patriarchal Clergy as Hagiopolitan Hymnographers

We have already seen that many Hagiopolitan hymnographers at the Great Palace in time became clergy at the patriarchate, including (at least) seven patriarchs: Germanos, Tarasios, Methodios, Ignatios, Photios, Nicholas Mystikos, and Euthymios. It is reasonable to assume that when Hagiopolitan hymnographers of the court became patriarchs, their involvement in the Hagiopolitan Daily Office could have in some way affected the place given to it in the patriarchate. On the other hand, a group of Hagiopolitan hymnographers who were clerics at the patriarchate did not have any particular connection with the Great Palace, so they are witnesses to a different liturgical trajectory. Five such hymnographers were attached to Hagia Sophia as patriarchal clergy for a shorter or longer period.

Monks in the Sinai,” *Arheografski Prilozi / Archeographical Papers* 37 (2015): 11–47.

123 I. C. Tarnanides, *The Slavonic Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine’s Monastery on Mount Sinai* (Thessalonike, 1988), 88–89.

124 On these Psalters, see most recently Parpulov, *Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters* (n. 18 above), 86–93.

125 In practice, this meant verses of about half the length of Hagiopolitan verses.

126 See M. Evangelatou, “Liturgy and the Illustration of the Ninth-Century Marginal Psalters,” *DOP* 63 (2009): 59–116, esp. 67.

127 I. E. Lozovaya and B. Fonkich, “O proiskhozhdenii khludovskoi psaltiri [On the origin of the Khludov Psalter],” in *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo: Iskusstvo rukopisni knigi: Bizantia, Drevniaia Rus’* (Saint Petersburg, 2004), 7–20.

128 Parpulov, *Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters*, 88–89, using other arguments, also contends that the Khludov Psalter was not connected with the Studios monastery.

129 Evangelatou, “Liturgy and the Illustration,” 69.

130 Various positions are described in *ibid.*, 61, n. 11.

Ignatios the Deacon (*PmbZ*, no. 2665, ca. 780¹³¹–ca. 847) was from early years a pupil of Tarasios, no doubt at secondary school level (ἐγκύκλιος παιδείασις)¹³² and probably after Tarasios became patriarch (784).¹³³ He was ordained deacon perhaps by Patriarch Nikephoros (806–15), whose close collaborator he was and whose *Life* he was to write. A poet and *grammatikos* (scholar, teacher), he was probably engaged in writing and chancellor work at the patriarchate. From no later than 829 he was the *skeuophylax* (sacristan) of Hagia Sophia. For some years, he was metropolitan of Nicaea; at the end of his life, he was a monk. He wrote kanons, probably including those for the translation of the relics of Patriarch Tarasios in 846 and of Patriarch Nikephoros in 847, both to the church of the Holy Apostles.¹³⁴

George of Nicomedia (*PmbZ*, no. 2259/22083, 800/820–ca. 885) was a monk and deacon of Hagia Sophia, preacher, *chartophylax* (archivist/librarian) of Hagia Sophia, and from 860/61 metropolitan of Nicomedia. He was a prolific hymnographer, apparently with particularly close connections to the church of Chalkoprateia.¹³⁵

Joseph the Hymnographer (*PmbZ*, no. 3454/23510, ca. 816–ca. 886), who was from Sicily, became a monk in Thessalonike at young age. He stayed in various monasteries; between 850 and 855 he founded

his own monastery in Constantinople but was banished to Cherson from 858 to 867. A close associate of Patriarch Ignatios, he joined the patriarchal clergy through his appointment as *skeuophylax* of Hagia Sophia by Emperor Basil I after returning to the capital in 867. Joseph is the most prolific of all Greek hymnographers.

Theognostos Hegumen (*PmbZ*, no. 8018, ninth century) was an important ally of Patriarch Ignatios and after 868 hegumen of the imperial monastery of Pege. He became *skeuophylax* of Hagia Sophia, possibly succeeding Joseph the Hymnographer. He is the author of homilies, of an iambic kanon for the Ascension (*Heirm.*), and, if it is the same Theognostos, of an alphabetic kanon for communion that has the acrostic Θεογνώστου within the last theotokion (printed in any modern Greek Horologion).

Nikephoros the Deacon of the Great Church (possibly *PmbZ*, no. 5306,¹³⁶ ninth century) is known for a kanon for St. Markianos (*Heirm.*).¹³⁷

All five Hagiopolitan hymnographers of the patriarchate seem to have been “cathedral monastics,” like Germanos and Andrew.¹³⁸ Three of them—Ignatios the Deacon, Joseph (867–ca. 886), and Theognostos (after Joseph)—were *skeuophylaxes* of Hagia Sophia.

Two examples illustrate the concrete use of the hymnography written by patriarchal clergy. In the sources, kanons for the translation of the relics of Patriarch Tarasios in 846 and of Patriarch Nikephoros in 847 to the church of the Holy Apostles are attributed to Ignatios. Cyril Mango finds reason to believe that the Ignatios in question is Ignatios the Deacon.¹³⁹

¹³⁶ Nikephoros, deacon and *chartophylax* of Nicaea, the main addressee of Ignatios the Deacon. If this is the right person, he may have been a deacon of Hagia Sophia and then followed Ignatios when the latter became archbishop of Nicaea. Another possible identification is *PmbZ*, no. 5269, deacon and *chartophylax* of the patriarch, who signed the council of Nicaea in 787.

¹³⁷ Eustratiades, *Εἰρημολόγιον* (n. 58 above), 18, mistakenly refers only to MS A (Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Coislin 220). The kanon figures also in MS B (Mount Athos Great Lavra MS B 32, fols. 32r–33r).

¹³⁸ Before becoming attached to the cathedral, both Joseph and Theognostos belonged to monasticism proper.

¹³⁹ The other alternative is Ignatios the patriarch, who was enthroned just a few months after the translation of the relics of Nikephoros.

131 C. Mango, *The Correspondence of Ignatios the Deacon* (Washington, DC, 1997), 23, gives a birth date of ca. 775–80; *PmbZ*, no. 2665, gives 785–90.

132 In his *Life of Tarasios* (*Ignatii Diaconi vita Tarasii Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani*, ed. A. Heikel, Acta societatis scientiarum fennicae 17 [Helsingfors, 1891], 395–423, esp. 423), Ignatios says he learned ancient prosody from Tarasios.

133 *PmbZ*, no. 2665. In “Observations on the Correspondence of Ignatius, Metropolitan of Nicaea (First Half of the Ninth Century),” in *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, TU 125 (Berlin, 1981), 407, Cyril Mango suggests that this schooling took place before Tarasios became patriarch; this presupposes an earlier date for Ignatios’s birth than what he would later argue in *The Correspondence of Ignatius* (23), so he evidently revised his view.

134 Mango identifies five kanons as being by Ignatios the Deacon (Mango, *The Correspondence of Ignatius*, 14–15).

135 As argued by D. Krausmüller, “Making the Most of Mary: The Cult of the Virgin in the Chalkoprateia from Late Antiquity to the Tenth Century,” in *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, ed. L. Brubaker and M. Cunningham (Burlington, VT, 2011), 219–45, esp. 233–34.

However, more important than authorship is the fact that these translations were necessarily “officially sponsored liturgical services,”¹⁴⁰ organized by the central ecclesiastical authority—in this case Patriarch Methodios (d. 847), himself a Hagiopolitan hymnographer. One part of this official, patriarchal sponsorship must have been the commissioning of the kanons themselves and the decision to have them sung at the services. We should note that Patriarch Methodios, before ascending the throne, was close to both patriarchate (Patriarch Nikephoros) and court (Emperor Theophilos), and was a friend of Ignatios, who wrote Nikephoros’s Life.

In the kanon for the translation of the relics of Patriarch Nikephoros (13 March), included in the received Menaion and written probably by Ignatios the Deacon, a troparion refers to the actual church—the Holy Apostles—where the relics will be placed, making clear that the kanon was intended for use there:

Looking upon the tomb that hath been acquired as a new altar whereon divine whole-burnt offerings are faithfully performed, with the lifeless, yet most sacred, wonderworker therein, we the faithful supremely exalt God. (ode 8, third troparion)¹⁴¹

The second example concerns the feast of the Virgin’s Girdle (31 August), a relic kept at Chalkoprateia, one of the churches served by the patriarchal clergy. Both Joseph the Hymnographer and George of Nicomedia composed a kanon for this feast.¹⁴² Both kanons contain phrases that explicitly show that they were written for use in the church of Chalkoprateia itself:¹⁴³

The temple of the Virgin, having found her exceedingly radiant sash as a bright unwaning lamp, today like a shining heaven doth light the whole world with beams of miracles. (George’s kanon, ode 1, first troparion)¹⁴⁴

As we compass thy shrine like the golden vessel of manna, O thou who alone art pure, we now partake of the truly divine delight of thy graces, and we honour it as the highest of the tokens we have of thee, O all-blessed Lady. (George’s kanon, ode 7, second troparion)¹⁴⁵

With reverence and gladness of heart, O Theotokos, we all embrace thine honourable sash, which, since it touched thine exceedingly honourable body, is the honour of all the faithful. (Joseph’s kanon, ode 3, fourth troparion)¹⁴⁶

O Maiden, we enter into thy house as into some new heaven wherein is treasured up, like a shining sun, thy divine sash[.] (Joseph’s kanon, ode 4, second troparion)¹⁴⁷

The third of these Hagiopolitan hymnographers of the patriarchate, Joseph the Hymnographer, resembles the Khludov Psalter in that he embraced both the Hagiopolitan and the Ecclesiastic Office. Joseph wrote both kanons/stichera and kontakia; but unlike that Psalter, he clearly favored the Hagiopolitan Office in his hymn writing. His enormous output of saints’ hymnography seems to point to a central initiative of creating a complete set of Hagiopolitan hymns for each day of the year, as Nancy Ševčenko has also suggested;¹⁴⁸ if so, its motivation resembles that which one may assume to lie behind the hymnographical production of Germanos and Andrew. Ševčenko rightly wonders whether Joseph wrote most of these hymns after becoming skeuophylax of Hagia Sophia, since only then would he have had access to the necessary

140 Mango, *The Correspondence of Ignatios*, 16.

141 *The Menaion*, trans. the Holy Transfiguration Monastery, vol. 7, *The Month of March* (Boston, 2005), 59.

142 Both kanons are included in the feast of 31 August. Only the kanon of Joseph has an author ascription (in the acrostic) in the received Menaion, where it is also the second kanon of the day. For the received Menaion, see in this case *Μηναία τοῦ ὅλου ἐνιαυτοῦ*, vol. 6, *July and August* (Rome, 1901) (hereafter MR). The first kanon of MR is attributed to George in Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Greek MS 631 (tenth or eleventh century), fols. 124r–126v; in this witness the kanon also has a second ode, whose rightful place is proved by the acrostic (absent in MR). Joseph’s kanon is also published in PG 105:1009D–1017D.

143 Krausmüller, “Making the Most of Mary,” 232, n. 79, makes a similar observation about another troparion of the same kanon.

144 *The Menaion*, trans. the Holy Transfiguration Monastery, vol. 12, *The Month of August* (Boston, 2005), 184.

145 *Ibid.*, 187.

146 *Ibid.*, 185.

147 *Ibid.*

148 N. P. Ševčenko, “Canon and Calendar: The Role of a Ninth-Century Hymnographer in Shaping the Celebration of the Saints,” in *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive?*, ed. L. Brubaker (Aldershot, 1998), 101–14.

information about the saints;¹⁴⁹ this scenario strengthens the hypothesis of a central initiative.

Another monastic Hagiopolitan hymnographer relevant here is the monk Mark, kanon composer and *oikonomos* of the church of St. Mokios at the beginning of the tenth century.¹⁵⁰ The church of St. Mokios goes back to the fourth century, was rebuilt as a large church (probably a basilica) in the first quarter of the sixth century, and was restored by Emperor Basil I (867–886). Its size and celebrity make it probable that it was a public (“catholic”) church.¹⁵¹ No source states explicitly that Mark’s hymns were sung in the church in which he served, but we can make that assumption. A monastery attached to the church, seemingly established no earlier than the ninth century,¹⁵² is where Mark must have lived as a monk.

Hagiopolitan “Contamination” of the Ecclesiastic Office

The two Daily Office traditions coexisting in the same city could not avoid influencing each other. Over time, and to varying degrees in different milieus, each of them was so to speak “contaminated” by the other. The Hagiopolitan Office received from the Ecclesiastic Office not the least the kontakion and the pannychis service, even though the form of each in the Hagiopolitan Office was for the most part abbreviated or altered, respectively. Since the Hagiopolitan Office in the end proved to be dominant, it is not surprising that the contamination was more widespread in the other direction.

The significance in isolation of Hagiopolitan liturgical elements, such as hymns and psalms typical of the Hagiopolitan Office, is not unambiguous. Given the possibility of Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic services—vespers, pannychis, or matins—one cannot be sure, absent more context, whether certain Hagiopolitan elements are evidence of the full

Hagiopolitan Office or of an insertion into services that are otherwise entirely Ecclesiastic—a Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic Office.

We need to look closely at such Hagiopolitanization of the Ecclesiastic Office to avoid appealing but wrong interpretations of the sources. We will start from later, less controversial cases of Hagiopolitanization and then move backward in time.

Hagiopolitan Elements in the Ecclesiastic Office in the Second Millennium

The first of two well-known documents, both belonging to the Ecclesiastic Office, is the mystagogical treatise *On Divine Prayer* by Symeon of Thessalonike (d. 1429), written when the cathedral of Thessalonike in principle still observed the Ecclesiastic Office. The Ecclesiastic vespers service that he describes includes Hagiopolitan elements: the evening hymn *Phos hilaron* at the entrance before the conclusion of *Kyrie ekekraxa* (Psalm 140, etc.),¹⁵³ then stichera at *Kyrie ekekraxa* (but en bloc after the psalms rather than between the last psalm verses as in the Hagiopolitan Office).¹⁵⁴ Matins, however, is much more Hagiopolitanized: after the regular Ecclesiastic psalmody ending with Psalm 50 follows a whole Hagiopolitan morning section: *Anavathmoi*, kanon, Gospel section after ode 6 of the kanon, *Exaposteilarion*, *Ainoi* (Psalms 148–50) with stichera, the Great Doxology, and another Gospel reading on Sundays and feasts.¹⁵⁵ The overall design of this matins service combines a full Ecclesiastic matins with a considerable portion of Hagiopolitan matins.¹⁵⁶

The second document is another well-known but considerably older case, the Dresden Sächsische Landesbibliothek MS A 104, which is a Praxapostolos

149 Ibid., 107, n. 19.

150 *PmbZ*, no. 24995, with references to the historiographical sources. Mark was probably later archbishop of Otranto. See Parenti, “The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople” (n. 3 above), 455–56, for a presentation and analysis of the incident at St. Mokios that led Emperor Leo VI to commission Hagiopolitan hymnography from Mark.

151 It is considered a “public” basilica by Bowes, *Private Worship, Public Values* (n. 40 above), 108.

152 Janin, *Les églises et les monastères* (n. 70 above), 355.

153 In this article, I use the Septuagint numbering of Psalms.

154 For a convenient outline of this service, see A. Lingas, “Festal Cathedral Vespers in Late Byzantium,” *OCP* 63 (1997): 421–59, esp. 426 (with relevant references).

155 PG 155:636–42. This is schematically summarized in A. Lingas, “Sunday Matins in the Byzantine Cathedral Rite: Music and Liturgy” (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1996), 222–23.

156 We must keep in mind that the type of Hagiopolitan matins inserted here is not the one found in Studite and Studite-derived traditions but rather the “catholic” or public Hagiopolitan Office (as shown by the placement of the Gospel section after ode 6); see below. *Ainoi* and the Great Doxology would in effect be applicable to both the services that are combined: *Ainoi* has both the Ecclesiastic refrains and the Hagiopolitan stichera.

of the eleventh century.¹⁵⁷ In it, most vespers and matins services are of a regular Ecclesiastic type, but we do also find two kinds of liturgical Hagiopolitanization. First, we see more or less complete and regular Hagiopolitan services, as in one vespers service and one matins service of Great Week.¹⁵⁸ Though rare, these are significant because they show that in some cases, important Hagiopolitan services could replace Ecclesiastic services in their entirety. Second, and more common, is the partial Hagiopolitan Office: that is, Hagiopolitan elements or even blocks. The vespers service celebrated at the feasts of the Nativity of Christ, Annunciation, Ascension, and Pentecost is a slightly Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic service, similar to what we already saw in Symeon of Thessalonike: the only Hagiopolitan element is the stichera, located at the same place; *Phos hilaron* is lacking.¹⁵⁹ Ecclesiastic matins is less Hagiopolitanized here than in Symeon. At Ecclesiastic matins of the Elevation of the Cross,¹⁶⁰ the Dresden Praxapostolos inserts an unspecified kanon as well as the Polyeleos at a different place than in Symeon's matins: between the stichology (here twelve variable antiphons) and the canticle of Daniel.¹⁶¹

157 K. K. Akent'ev, *Tipikon velikoi tserkvi. Cod. Dresde A 104: Rekonstruktsiia teksta po materialam arkhiva A. A. Dmitrievskogo* [Typikon of the Great Church. Cod. Dresden A 104: Reconstruction of the text from the material of the archive of A. A. Dmitrievsky] (Saint Petersburg, 2008). This recent reconstruction of the codex, which was badly damaged in the Second World War, is based on all the available material from Dmitrievsky, including but going beyond what he published in *Drevnieishie patriarskie tipikony: Sviatogorski i ierusalimskii i velikoi konstantinopol'skoi tserkvi* [The oldest patriarchal Typika: Of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem and of the Great Church of Constantinople] (Kiev, 1907), esp. 114–347. The Praxapostolos is a lectionary containing the “epistle” readings, taken from both the letters of the New Testament and Acts.

158 A variant of Hagiopolitan vespers of Great Thursday: a complete vespers service (not cut off after the readings), without *Phos hilaron* but, strangely, with two odes (5 and 6) from the kanon of the day placed after the Aposticha (Akent'ev, *Tipikon velikoi tserkvi*, 78–80); a variant of Hagiopolitan Matins of Great Friday that closely resembles the present service (which in itself represents a mixed office; Akent'ev, *Tipikon velikoi tserkvi*, 82–83).

159 Akent'ev, *Tipikon velikoi tserkvi*, 115, 119 (the stichera section is one of the elements removed when the emperor is present), 53, 55.

160 This matins service is prescribed twice in the Dresden Praxapostolos; the kanon is in the second version. See B. Flusin, “Les cérémonies de l'Exaltation de la Croix à Constantinople au XI^e siècle d'après le Dresdensis A 104,” in Durand and Flusin, *Byzance et les reliques du Christ* (n. 70 above), esp. 63, 83.

161 Akent'ev, *Tipikon velikoi tserkvi*, 104.

Ecclesiastic matins of the Sunday of the Forefathers contains the Hexapsalm (but no other Hagiopolitan elements are mentioned).¹⁶² There is no doubt that the Hagiopolitanization of Ecclesiastic vespers and matins was widespread by the eleventh century.¹⁶³

To the Dresden manuscript, we may add other Praxapostolos witnesses from the eleventh century onward, which show a quite different form of Hagiopolitanization: the juxtaposition of complete services of the two rites. As Parenti has pointed out,¹⁶⁴ in such cases a complete Hagiopolitan service—for instance, vespers—is followed by a complete Ecclesiastic ordo of the same service.

Hagiopolitan Elements in the Ecclesiastic Office in the First Millennium

The Hagiopolitan influence on the Ecclesiastic Office started considerably earlier than the cases reviewed above. Let us go back one more century. Though Jerusalem Greek Orthodox Patriarchate MS Holy Cross 40—the main witness of the Kanonarion-Synaxarion of the Great Church, whose content dates to the middle of the tenth century (945–59)—is on the whole a “pure” Ecclesiastic document, it does include some Hagiopolitan elements that are clearly additions to the Kanonarion-Synaxarion. We must take these additions seriously, because the manuscript is believed to have been copied and used in Constantinople,¹⁶⁵ albeit not necessarily in Hagia Sophia itself. On the last day before Great Lent (Sunday of Cheesefare) an additional note appears,¹⁶⁶ concerning the compline service (Ἀποδείπνια¹⁶⁷): it is not to be chanted except for a very small part (presumably that evening), while on Monday, and implicitly on the following Lenten days, one chants the kanon and reads Psalter unit(s) (κάθισμα) in such-and-such a way. We see here that the church using this Kanonarion-Synaxarion has added to its Ecclesiastic Office a Hagiopolitan compline service that includes a kanon (if there is one, it says) and one or

162 Ibid., 110.

163 As also argued in Parenti, “The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople,” 458.

164 Ibid., “The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople,” 459–60.

165 Mateos, *Le typicon de la Grande Église* (n. 11 above), 1:ix–x.

166 Ibid., 2:10.

167 The term Ἀποδείπνια, a variant of Ἀπόδειπνον, unambiguously denotes a compline service of Palestinian tradition.

two Psalter kathismata; perhaps this service was held only during Great Lent, since the rubric appears at the beginning of that season. Further, a supplement to this Kanonarion-Synaxarion witness prescribes the section known as “the Jerusalem Resurrection Office”¹⁶⁸ for matins of Sundays and feasts,¹⁶⁹ as well as Hagiopolitan prokeimena for daily vespers.¹⁷⁰

Finally, in the source material we see evidence of Jerusalem’s influence on the Ecclesiastic Office already visible in the ninth century. One Gospel lectionary prescribes a Gospel reading for the pannychis service, and not for matins as in Jerusalem and the Hagiopolitan Office: Vatican Biblioteca Apostolica MS Greek 2144 (the so-called Morcelli calendar),¹⁷¹ a

document whose considerable correspondence with the patriarchal lectionary type of the eleventh century has been noted by Robert Nelson.¹⁷² It is datable to the ninth century on paleographical grounds, and its calendar shows clear signs of being earlier than that of Patmos Monastery of Saint John the Theologian MS 266, whose content is datable to the late ninth century. Some other Gospel lectionaries, despite regularly having the Gospel reading in matins, occasionally place it in pannychis.¹⁷³ These Gospel readings form a part of the Resurrection Office, and the location in pannychis no doubt indicates an earlier stage; the reading soon was placed in matins, as seen both in (ninth- and tenth-century) Gospel lectionaries and in the (mid-tenth-century) Kanonarion-Synaxarion.

The pannychis service in question here is probably identical or similar to that found in documents from the eleventh century onward. This kind of pannychis is an Ecclesiastic service with Psalm 90 and the three antiphons (Psalms 119, 120, 121), onto which is grafted the Hagiopolitan section consisting of Psalm 50, the prokeimenon, *Pasa Pnoē*, and the Gospel.¹⁷⁴ Since there originally was no pre-Eucharistic Gospel (that is, in pannychis or matins) in the Ecclesiastic Office, and since the pannychis Gospel was preceded by the Palestinian *Pasa Pnoē*, the pannychis Gospel section seems to represent an imitation or adaptation of the Hagiopolitan morning (*heōthina*) Gospel section. One Euchologion manuscript attributes some prayers of

168 On this office, see my article in two parts: S. Frøyshov, “The Resurrection Office of the First Millennium Jerusalem Liturgy and Its Adoption by Close Peripheries. Part I: The Pre-Gospel Section,” in *Studies on the Liturgies of the Christian East: Selected Papers from the Third International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Volos, May 26–30, 2010*, ed. S. Hawkes-Teeples, B. Groen, and S. Alexopoulos (Leuven, 2013), 31–57, and “The Resurrection Office of First-Millennium Jerusalem Liturgy and Its Adoption by Close Peripheries. Part II: The Gospel Reading and the Post-Gospel Section,” in *Sion, mère des Églises: Mélanges liturgiques offerts au Père Charles Athanase Renoux*, ed. M. D. Findikyan, D. Galadza, and A. Lossky (Münster, 2016), 109–47.

169 Mateos, *Le typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:170–74, 180–84. The word *ἑωθινῶν* in the title (170), which corresponds to the matins service, shows that the Kanonarion-Synaxarion places the section of the Resurrection Office in matins and not in pannychis.

170 Ibid., 2:178–80. According to Moffatt and Tall’s translation of a passage of Constantine’s *Book of Ceremonies* (n. 73 above) dating from the mid-tenth-century, matins at Hagia Sophia included a nine-ode kanon—but this interpretation is clearly erroneous. The passage describes the cross being carried out of Hagia Sophia on Friday of the fourth week of Lent: “after the conclusion of the ninth ode, the *papias* escorts the precious cross into the Sacred Palace” (2.11, 550). The manuscript, Leipzig University Library MS *Rep. I*, 17, upon which the edition is based, was copied during the reign of Nikephoros II Phokas (963–969) (xxiii). However, the Greek says only *μετὰ τὴν ἀπόλυσιν τῆς ἐνάτης* (l. 15), so “ode” is conjectured, no doubt incorrectly. Whenever *The Book of Ceremonies* mentions odes of the matins service, the word “ode” is explicated (see, e.g., ll. 18–19: *καὶ τῇ κυριακῇ μετὰ τρίτην εἶτε καὶ ἑκτὴν ὥδην τοῦ ὁρθρου*); furthermore, *apolyxis* is a technical term denoting the end of a service, not of an ode. My interpretation that this passage concerns the ninth hour and not the ninth ode is shared by H. Klein, “Constantine, Helena, and the Cult of the True Cross in Constantinople,” in Durand and Flusin, *Byzance et les reliques du Christ*, 31–59, esp. 53: “on none [ninth hour] on Friday.”

171 This reading is for 11 November, the eve of St. John Chrysostom (S. A. Morcelli, ed., *Kalendarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, 2 vols. [Rome, 1788], 1:31–32). That it has no matins Gospel indicates

that it belonged to the Constantinopolitan rite of Hagia Sophia and not the Byzantine rite.

172 R. Nelson, “Patriarchal Lectionaries of Constantinople: History, Attributions, and Prospects,” in *The New Testament in Byzantium*, ed. D. Krueger and R. S. Nelson (Washington, DC, 2016), 87–115, esp. 110–11.

173 Among these lectionaries are Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Greek MS 211 (first half of the ninth century; the single occurrence is at the Annunciation) and Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Greek 281 (ninth century; 29 August for St. John the Forerunner).

174 Such a Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic pannychis is found in several documents, conveniently summarized by M. Arranz, “Les prières presbytérales de la ‘Pannychis’ de l’ancien Euchologe byzantine et la ‘Panikhida’ des défunts,” *OCP* 40 (1974): 314–43; the Dresden Praxapostolos (336), the “Anastasis Typikon” (Jerusalem Holy Cross 43, without Psalm 90) (340), and Symeon of Thessalonike, *On Divine Prayer* (340).

pannychis to Germanos,¹⁷⁵ but I know of no example in the sources of Ecclesiastic pannychis that includes the kanon genre promoted by him.

Another service also called “pannychis” incorporated Hagiopolitan hymnography and retained only a few Ecclesiastic elements. It had the Ecclesiastic prayers but not the three antiphons, and a kanon formed its major part. This “Hagiopolitan pannychis,” as we might call it, figures in both Hagiopolitan and Ecclesiastic contexts. Early examples from a Hagiopolitan context are the pannychis of the tenth-century Hypotyposis of St. Athanasios the Athonite¹⁷⁶ and the pannychis of Friday of the first week of Great Lent as well as that of Great Saturday, both in the Dresden Praxapostolos.¹⁷⁷

What Is the Earliest “Hagiopolitanized” Ecclesiastic Office?

As we will see, it is very likely that Germanos and Andrew were involved in the practice of a full Hagiopolitan Daily Office in the early eighth century and that the patriarchate of Constantinople had embraced the Hagiopolitan Office as a canonical rite by the mid-ninth century. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the full Hagiopolitan Office was continuously observed between these two points in time. It is quite certain that following its institution in Constantinople and for several centuries thereafter, Hagiopolitan liturgical elements normally subsisted within the full Hagiopolitan Office; consequently, the Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic Office—produced by grafting Hagiopolitan elements grafted onto the Ecclesiastic Office—was a secondary form.

Not only was the Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic Office secondary; it was not a single, homogenous tradition. Some of the liturgical structures described above are quite stable, including the additions of stichera en bloc after *Kyrie ekekraxa* at vespers and of the Hagiopolitan Gospel section at pannychis. But Hagiopolitanized

matins does not show the same structural uniformity. In Symeon, the Hagiopolitan matins part appears after the morning psalmody, the Daniel canticle, and Psalm 50 with the *Pentekostaria*, while in the earlier Dresden Praxapostolos it belongs to the morning psalmody preceding the Daniel canticle. This amounts to a significant structural and conceptual difference. The Dresden document itself reveals different kinds of Hagiopolitan influence on matins, since in another case there is only mention of the Hexapsalm. The structural variation in Hagiopolitanized matins suggests that the insertions of Hagiopolitan hymnography represent independent solutions and do not reflect an established tradition. If a well-established Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic matins had existed, there would have been consistency in the sources, however few there are.

The need for a Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic Office would have arisen only in a milieu in which the primary desire was to maintain the Ecclesiastic Office; otherwise, the full Hagiopolitan Office could have been adopted. The prevalence of the matins Gospel in ninth-century Gospel lectionaries and the rarity of the pannychis Gospel suggest that the spread of the Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic Office in the ninth century was weak—perhaps limited to patriarchal circles, to which the Morcelli calendar most probably belongs. The patriarchal churches seem to have been precisely such a milieu that sought to maintain the Ecclesiastic Office but, faced with the gradual increase of the Hagiopolitan Office, adopted some of the Hagiopolitan Office elements, notably the Resurrection Office and hymnography.

From the above points, we can conclude that the addition of Hagiopolitan hymnography into Ecclesiastic Matins was neither an early nor a coordinated phenomenon; instead, it resulted from scattered initiatives from the ninth century onward and was limited to patriarchal churches and to those other public churches that still might have observed the Ecclesiastic Office. This dating and contextualization of the Hagiopolitanization of the Ecclesiastic Office will provide a significant basis for my discussion in the following section.¹⁷⁸

175 Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Greek MS 959, fol. 144r (see Arranz, “Les prières presbytérales de la ‘Pannychis,’” 328).

176 P. Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster: Grösstentheils zum ersten Male* (Leipzig, 1894), 132; BMFD, 1:222.

177 Akent’ev, *Tipikon velikoï tserkvi* (n. 157 above), 68–69, 87. For an ordo summary of the first, see Arranz, “Les prières presbytérales de la ‘Pannychis,’” 336–37.

178 The Hagiopolitanization of the Ecclesiastic Office must be further studied: a shift in its dating to considerably earlier would affect how we should view the development of the Hagiopolitan Office in Constantinople.

Interpretation of the Material: The Ecclesiastical Milieu and Status of the Hagiopolitan Daily Office in Constantinople

Having so far mostly presented and analyzed various material and evidence, here I will proceed to discussing and interpreting the evidence.

The Beginnings of the Hagiopolitan Office in Constantinople

How and when did the Jerusalem Daily Office begin in Constantinople? The hymnography attributed to Germanos (ca. 655–ca. 740s) and Andrew (ca. 660–740) constitutes a substantial piece of evidence as we begin to answer this question. The close connection between the heirmoi attributed to Germanos and the Old Tropologion¹⁷⁹ implies that the Old Tropologion was known and in actual use in Constantinople when Germanos—or another hymnographer from the area, if he was not the author¹⁸⁰—wrote these heirmoi. If we assume that the old hymnal gradually went out of use as new hymns were composed, the reuse of stanzas from it (with differing degrees of revision) as heirmoi would belong to an early stage of the formation of the New Tropologion. Were New Tropologion hymns being written in Constantinople at the same time as those in Jerusalem and Damascus? The arrival in Constantinople in 685 of Andrew, who had grown up in Damascus and become a monk in Jerusalem, marks the latest possible time that church circles of the capital learned of the emerging composition of the new Tropologion

corpus in Palestine. But given that new ideas and texts circulated quite rapidly within the Empire and Greek Christendom, it is possible that the newly composed kanons and stichera were known in Constantinople well before Andrew's arrival. Thus the heirmoi attributed to Germanos could very well have been written in Germanos's lifetime and by Germanos himself.

How did Germanos encounter and learn to use the Old Tropologion, some of whose stanzas he made use of, perhaps retaining their melody? There is no evidence that the Constantinopolitan Germanos visited Palestine in his adulthood,¹⁸¹ or, as already noted, that he stayed at any monastery. Did Germanos come to know the Old Tropologion from Andrew? We know that Andrew composed and brought with him new hymnography in 685, but he could also have brought with him the ancient hymnal, which must only gradually have gone out of use. However, if it were Andrew who brought the Jerusalem Daily Office to Constantinople, one would expect that as a monk or Spoudaios of the Anastasis cathedral he would have brought with him the Horologion redaction then in use at the Anastasis cathedral. We have already seen that the Anastasis Horologion of the seventh century had been (recently) reorganized, starting with the first hour and not with nocturns-matins, the service with which the Horologion actually adopted in Constantinople no doubt started. We can thus make an important assumption: the Old Tropologion was present and used in Constantinople independently of and before Andrew's arrival, and Germanos therefore came to know the Old Tropologion in Constantinople not from Andrew but from some liturgical milieu that was already using it. Germanos was supposedly around thirty when Andrew arrived and could very well have become familiar with the Old Tropologion when younger.

Under which liturgical circumstances could the Old Tropologion have existed in Constantinople in the seventh century? It is hard to imagine that kanons and stichera were written in Constantinople in the seventh century without being intended for use with the Horologion. The kanon genre, especially through the heirmoi, is by its nature intimately tied to the biblical canticles. Ecclesiastic pannychis and matins did

179 The view that they themselves contributed to the Old Iadgari is clearly erroneous and must be rejected. That hymnal undoubtedly predates them, as I argue in Frøyshov, "The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy" (n. 13 above), 237.

180 Kosta Simic has recently cast doubt on the attribution of hymns to Germanos, but the question is far from settled. See K. Simic, "Liturgical Poetry in the Middle Byzantine Period: Hymns Attributed to Germanos I, Patriarch of Constantinople (715–730)" (PhD diss., Australian Catholic University, 2017). There is evidence for their Constantinopolitan origin independent of the question of authorship: they contain the second ode, which was omitted by John of Damascus and Kosmas and perhaps generally in Jerusalem at that time; several kanons attributed to Germanos and using heirmoi attributed to him concern Constantinopolitan saints, such as Patriarch John the Faster; and the earliest manuscript witness of the Greek Heirmologion, which clearly is of Palestinian origin, appears to omit heirmoi that are elsewhere attributed to Germanos (see Frøyshov, "Rite of Jerusalem" [n. 23 above]).

181 According to a later legend, Germanos went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem before his castration—in other words, very early (see Lamza, *Patriarch Germanos I* [n. 51 above], 65), but earlier biographical accounts do not include this pilgrimage.

not have the Hagiopolitan series of nine biblical canticles; Ecclesiastic matins had a different selection of (fourteen) canticles, and Ecclesiastic pannychis did not have canticles at all. It would be strange if Germanos and Andrew wrote heirmoi—or used or revised Old Tropologion stanzas as heirmoi—with allusions to the respective biblical canticles if the heirmoi, and the kanons of which they were a part, were not meant to be sung with the Hagiopolitan canticles. This means that in seventh-century Constantinople, the hymns of Jerusalem genres were used together with the Horologion. If the Horologion with its inserted hymnography was used, the Jerusalem Psalter was no doubt used as well, since these three parts fit together as the integral parts of the Jerusalem Daily Office. We may assume, then, that the full Daily Office of Jerusalem—Horologion, Psalter, and Tropologion—was observed somewhere in Constantinople in the seventh century and that Germanos encountered this full Office.

At a certain time, as noted above, some Constantinopolitan church started to combine the Jerusalem Daily Office with the lectionary (including the calendar) and the Euchologion of Hagia Sophia, thereby creating the Byzantine rite. When might this have happened? To answer that question, we should begin by noting that Germanos and Andrew wrote for the Byzantine rite, since their hymnography presupposes the calendar of Constantinople. The liturgical synthesis that we call the “Byzantine rite” thus existed by the late seventh century. Indeed, it is a real possibility that it was created by the circles for which Germanos and Andrew wrote their hymns. First, the new, Byzantine rite required hymnography for feasts of the Constantinopolitan calendar that were not in the Jerusalem calendar for which the Old Tropologion had been composed, and we know that Germanos and Andrew composed such hymns. Second, enough hymns attributed to Germanos and Andrew are unquestionably genuine that we can envisage a more or less coordinated initiative to create a complete hymnography for this local annual calendar, which was not yet replete with daily celebrations. It could be that this hymnographic initiative formed part of the broader project of the Byzantine liturgical synthesis.

It is natural to reflect more deeply about both the chronology and liturgy of the early history of the Jerusalem Daily Office in Constantinople. In the above discussion, examination of the Horologion

demonstrated that Germanos knew the Old Tropologion from a church milieu in the capital that already used it. How far back in time does this argument lead us? If we opt for a late sixth- to early seventh-century date for the reorganization of the Horologion in Jerusalem, resulting in the extensive daily cycle (twenty-four services) of the Horologion known from Georgian sources,¹⁸² the Jerusalem rite would have appeared in Constantinople before ca. 600 if its adoption occurred directly from the Jerusalem cathedral. However, the well-known liturgical dynamic of center and periphery, then present in Palestine, prevents us from drawing any firm conclusion.¹⁸³ Major cathedrals were liturgical centers whose episcopal or patriarchal rites enjoyed a canonical status in their ecclesiastical region, while public churches and monasteries under the supervision of the bishop or the patriarch, as peripheries, received and adopted the center’s rite—and thereafter kept it in its received or an earlier state while the central rite continued to evolve.¹⁸⁴ It is not possible, given the current state of research, to know whether the Jerusalem Daily Office was received in Constantinople directly from the Anastasis cathedral, the center, or through the channel of a conservative periphery of the Jerusalem cathedral such as the cenobion of St. Theodosios or the Great Lavra of St. Sabas. In the latter scenario, a conservative periphery could have resisted the Horologion reform and retained the older cursus for some time after changes at the center.¹⁸⁵ Combining the evidence of St. Germanos’s hymnography and the Horologion, we may therefore conclude that the Jerusalem Daily Office had been adopted and was practiced somewhere in Constantinople by the first half of the seventh century. Only further research—for instance, on Horologion

182 The Horologion of Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Georgian MS 34 (ed. in Frøyshov, “L’Horologe ‘géorgien’ du Sinaiticus ibericus 34” [n. 2 above]) and its more recent redaction in Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Georgian MS N.23.

183 For more on center and periphery in Palestine, see Frøyshov, “The Book of Hours of Armenia and Jerusalem” (n. 2 above).

184 Robert Taft formulated the “law of the paradox of the periphery”; see R. Taft, “Anton Baumstark’s Comparative Liturgy Revisited,” in *Acts of the International Congress: Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948)*, Rome, 25–29 September 1998, ed. R. Taft and G. Winkler, OCA 265 (Rome, 2001), 191–232, esp. 214–16.

185 By the ninth century, the Great Lavra of St. Sabas had adopted the cursus beginning with the first hour, as seen in the Horologion of Sinai Monastery of Saint Catherine Greek MS 863 dated to that century, but we do not know when the adoption occurred.

history and on hymnography of Jerusalem genres certainly or possibly written in Constantinople—can determine whether we should push back the date of the arrival of the Jerusalem Daily Office in Constantinople.

In the absence of sources able to shed light on the circumstances of this arrival—how the Jerusalem Daily Office began to be performed in Constantinople at all—we must carefully reflect on the internal logic of the elements that are at our disposal. Either the Jerusalem Daily Office was adopted in Constantinople separately from the rest of the Jerusalem rite (Euchologion and lectionary) and immediately combined with the Euchologion and lectionary of Constantinople, or it arrived in Constantinople as part of the full Jerusalem rite. We should note that as in any liturgical rite, the various books of the Jerusalem rite were intimately connected: the calendar of the Old Tropologion was that of Jerusalem, this calendar was also retained in the lectionary, the service structures were those of the Horologion, and the Horologion had prayers from the Jerusalem Euchologion and stichology units from the Jerusalem Psalter. In fact, it would have been impossible to use the Old Tropologion in a normal way together with the calendar of Constantinople, because some of its feasts composed for the Jerusalem calendar would have been superfluous, and feasts that were observed in Constantinople but not in Jerusalem would have been missing. Thus, if the Jerusalem Daily Office arrived in Constantinople detached from the rest of the Jerusalem rite, an immediate revision of the Old Tropologion including the composition of hymns for local feasts would have been necessary. Such a manner of liturgical transmission would have been unorganic, requiring incoherent and abrupt moves, and seems improbable.

It is more likely that the elements of the Jerusalem Daily Office—the Old Tropologion, the Horologion, and the Psalter—were initially brought to Constantinople as parts of a package of the complete Jerusalem rite and that this foreign rite was initially observed in a very limited way. The practice of the full Jerusalem rite could have started in a representational or monastic context in Constantinople:¹⁸⁶ for instance, at the imperial monastery of Chora, known to have had

Palestinian connections.¹⁸⁷ Ideologically, the appearance in Constantinople of the Jerusalem rite could have been connected with the idea of realizing the city as “New Jerusalem,”¹⁸⁸ and the transmission of numerous relics from Jerusalem to the imperial capital could have had the same goal. Only further research may provide a clearer and more fully substantiated picture.

The Ecclesiastical Context of the Hymnography of Germanos and Andrew

Having concluded that Germanos and Andrew wrote hymns for a full Hagiopolitan Daily Office already in use in Constantinople, we can now investigate the church context of their hymnography. Specifically, which churches performed the Hagiopolitan services for which Germanos and Andrew wrote kanons

Les églises et les monastères [n. 70 above], 11–12), in which the Daily Office was probably of Egyptian tradition.

187 For the monastery of Chora as imperial, see Hatlie, *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople* (n. 105 above), 164. The circumstances of its foundation are uncertain and presented differently in different sources, but a sixth-century origin seems clear. If we stick to the point of view of the ninth-century Vita of Michael Synkellos (*The Life of Michael the Synkellos*, ed. and trans. M. B. Cunningham [Belfast, 1991], 106–9), written at Chora itself, during his second visit to Constantinople (in 531) St. Sabas was sent to the Chora monastery, whose construction by Justinian had just been finished, to inspect it and bless it. Justinian “commanded that priests and monks from Jerusalem who had arrived in this all-holy monastery should take rest there” (107). If this account corresponds to some historical reality, it would not be unreasonable to hypothesize that the Chora liturgy was entirely composed of the Jerusalem rite, possibly in the recension of the cenobitism of St. Theodosios or the Great Lavra of St. Sabas, in order to accommodate and suit the Palestinian monks (though neither recension of the Jerusalem rite constituted any typologically monastic office or contained more typologically monastic elements than were already present in the rite of the Jerusalem cathedral). The imperial status of the Chora monastery could have facilitated a later transfer of the Jerusalem Daily Office from Chora to the Great Palace or some other central ecclesiastical context—but there are other accounts of the origin of Chora, and it is of course just one possibility among many.

188 About this idea, see B. Flusin, “Conférence de M. Bernard Flusin,” in *Annuaire—École pratique des hautes études, Section des sciences religieuses* 108 (1999–2000): 333–37, esp. 334, and J. Erdeljan, *Chosen Places: Constructing New Jerusalem in Slavia Orthodoxa*, trans. I. Šentevska (Leiden and Boston, 2017), ch. 5, esp. 72–118. Interestingly, Andrew uses the term “New Jerusalem” in his canon for Palm Sunday (see R. Maisano, “Un inno inedito di S. Andrea di Creta per la Domenica delle palme,” *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 6 [1970]: 519–72, esp. 523, l. 14).

186 It was not uncommon for “foreign” liturgical traditions to be represented in the imperial capital, in both secular and monastic contexts: for instance, the Monastery of the Egyptians (Janin,

and stichera? The patriarchal churches are definitely excluded, since it would take several centuries before they observed the full Hagiopolitan Office. It would not be surprising if Andrew had his hymns sung by the excellent children's choir at the Orphanotropheion, as he was its head from about 685 to 711.¹⁸⁹ If so, the Hagiopolitan Office would have been observed in the Orphanotropheion's church of St. Paul's church, which was a "pious house/foundation" and had the status of an imperial, nonpublic church.¹⁹⁰ Thus Andrew, despite being a member of the patriarchal clergy, may have practiced the Hagiopolitan Office in a nonpublic church; what about Germanos?

According to what we know of his life before he became a bishop, Germanos belonged to a public church context. That was probably a nonpatriarchal public church, since he was involved in a full Hagiopolitan Daily Office, which a patriarchal church at that time would have been extremely unlikely to observe. Perhaps he was temporarily assigned from the patriarchal clergy to a public church; alternatively, "catholic church" might be understood in Germanos's case as signifying the public church at large. If Germanos's hymns were sung in a seventh-century public church that followed the Hagiopolitan Office, his extensive hymnographic production for the local church calendar might reasonably be explained as a central initiative made by no less an authority than the patriarchate. In that case, the embrace of two different rites that we observed in the ninth century would to some extent have already existed two centuries earlier.

Another and perhaps more likely possibility is that the hymns were sung in a nonpublic church of the Great Palace. As we have seen, the imperial court emerged no later than the eighth century as a visible arena of the Hagiopolitan Office. The sources do not say that Germanos had a career there, but as noted above, the imperial court—especially the Pharos church—was a privileged place for the Hagiopolitan Office in the ninth century and earlier. Since Germanos and his family, who belonged to the higher

echelons of the court, were seen as enemies of Emperor Constantine IV, who castrated Germanos, he could scarcely have begun his service in the Great Palace. But perhaps he returned to the court under the following emperor, Justinian II (685–695, 705–711), with whom he was likely on good terms—he was probably already metropolitan of Kyzikos during Justinian's second reign.¹⁹¹ Also, even though most scholars, including Magdalino, believe that the Pharos church was probably constructed under Constantine V, Magdalino at the same time observes that the church "is found in a part of the Palace which develops in the sixth and seventh centuries," adding, "it is perhaps in the wake of the 6th Council [680–81] that we must search for the origins both of the Pharos church and the ceremonial which there manifests the association of the emperor with the events and instruments of Christ's passion."¹⁹² It is precisely in the aftermath of the Sixth Ecumenical Council that Germanos would have been active as hymnographer—and what would have been more natural for the ceremonial of the Pharos church to be Hagiopolitan, since the Daily Office of Jerusalem would have served so well to associate the emperor with Christ's passion?

That these two Hagiopolitan hymnographers became bishops, and Germanos even a patriarch, no doubt contributed to the process by which the Hagiopolitan Office evolved from a "private" office of non-"catholic" churches to a public office of the patriarchate.

The Hagiopolitan Office during the Period of Iconoclast Controversies

Not long after the time of St. Germanos and St. Andrew, we find new Hagiopolitan hymnographers, all mentioned above: St. Tarasios (b. ca. 730) and the brothers St. Theodore the Studite (b. 759) and Joseph of Thessalonike (b. ca. 762). After these, Hagiopolitan hymnographers appear successively: Emperor Michael I Rhangabes (b. ca. 770), Patriarch Methodios I (b. before 785), Ignatios the Deacon (b. 785/790), Patriarch Ignatios (b. 798/99), Emperor Theophilos (b. 800/805), Patriarch Photios (b. 810/20), and so forth. Thus Hagiopolitan

189 See Miller, *The Orphans of Byzantium* (n. 55 above), 214, referring to Maisano, "Un inno inedito de S. Andrea."

190 Magdalino, "Churches, Imperial" (n. 46 above), 457, category 2. The quoted phrase is from Miller, *The Orphans of Byzantium*, 4–5.

191 The following emperor, Philippikos Bardanes, took over 11 December 711, and Germanos is numbered among the participants in Constantinople of the Monothelite Council of 712.

192 Magdalino, "L'église du Phare" (n. 70 above), 22.

hymnographers, from Germanos and Andrew in the first half of the eighth century through to the ninth century, follow each other almost without break.¹⁹³ Strikingly, those in this continuous line belonged to the very highest rung of society: all of them except Methodios came from the cultural elite employed in the civil service of the imperial court, and all except Ignatios (who was himself metropolitan of Nicaea) became either emperor or patriarch. We may thus assume that at this time, Hagiopolitan Office was highly prestigious.

In his youth, in the late eighth and early ninth century, Ignatios the Deacon was taught by Patriarch Tarasios, either through personal tutoring or in a patriarchal school. Ignatios, whose biography does not mention ties to the court, is important for our understanding of the use of the Hagiopolitan Office in patriarchal circles. When Patriarch Methodios, himself a Hagiopolitan hymnographer, in 846 and 847 commissioned kanons from Ignatios for the translation of relics, this request did not represent an innovation but rather perpetuated a hymnographical tradition to which Ignatios had been introduced within the patriarchate a half century earlier.

Because these liturgical developments were underway over a long time span that included Iconoclasm, we must consider whether the use and promotion of the Hagiopolitan Office could have been linked in any way with either position in that controversy. Notably, three patriarchs associated with the Iconophiles were also Hagiopolitan hymnographers: Germanos, Tarasios, and Methodios. It might be tempting to interpret the Hagiopolitan Office as reflecting the Iconophile position. However, this view is unsustainable, since we also find Hagiopolitan hymnographers and singers who were Iconoclasts: during the second Iconoclasm the emperors Leo V and Theophilos were deeply engaged in the performance of Hagiopolitan hymns—Theophilos even wrote such hymns—and Ignatios the Deacon sided with the Iconoclasts for a period, before returning to the Iconophiles.

Some of the prominent monastic Hagiopolitan hymnographers, such as the brothers Theodore and Joseph the Studites as well as the hegumena Kassia

(*PmbZ*, no. 3637, b. ca. 800–805, dead before 867), had received their education as children of the court's cultural elite. Studies at the secondary level included ancient poetry (within the field of grammar) and music.¹⁹⁴ It is quite possible that as part of their schooling before they entered monastic life, they had learned the Hagiopolitan liturgy and its hymnography. If so, the likely source of the Studite liturgy was not necessarily only monastic liturgy in Bithynia, brought there by Palestinian monks after the Arab invasion, but also, or even primarily, liturgical practice at the court.

Almost all the known Hagiopolitan hymnographers born in the eighth century emerged from the imperial court, making it the primary context in which the Hagiopolitan Office continued after Germanos and Andrew. This accords with the nonpublic context of Andrew's hymn writing in Constantinople and with the assumed context of Germanos's hymnography, at least before he was patriarch. Therefore, it seems that the Hagiopolitan Daily Office was practiced in a nonpublic context from (at the latest) the seventh century up through the first half of the ninth century, when the Hagiopolitan Office was adopted by public churches.

The Hagiopolitan Office as Canonical Daily Office of the Public Church in Constantinople

Whereas much of what I have said so far is characterized by numerous uncertainties, the ninth-century Byzantine mission to the Bulgars and the early history of the Bulgarian Church provide clear and indisputable evidence. This evidence concerning the early Bulgarian Daily Office informs us not only about the liturgy of the daughter church but also, and more importantly for our purposes, about the liturgical tradition of the mother church that stood behind the mission—that is, the patriarchal and imperial powers. This liturgical tradition was the full Hagiopolitan Office, including the Horologion, the Psalter, and the hymnography—all three elements.

Several points can be drawn from the Bulgarian case. First, it would have been strange for the patriarchate of Constantinople to choose for this new church a Daily Office that was not used in its own segment of churches, the public ("catholic") ones, and according to its liturgical canon. Consequently, the Hagiopolitan Office seems to have been part of the patriarchal canon

193 Presumably if there were Hagiopolite hymnographers during the first Iconoclast period—which is possible, in light of the apparent continuity of hymnographers—they would have been erased from memory or given pseudonyms.

194 See the description of Theodore's education in R. Cholij, *Theodore the Stoudite: The Ordering of Holiness* (Oxford, 2002), 19–24.

of public liturgy in the second half of the ninth century. Second, it would have been unnatural for the patriarch to choose a liturgy for a church in Bulgaria intended for all the people that was followed only by monastics in Constantinople. This argument leads to the same conclusion: namely, that the Hagiopolitan Office was observed in Constantinople not only by monasteries but also by a significant part of the public church.

It seems, therefore, that there was a dual canon for public Daily Office (in other words, two different public Daily Offices) in the patriarchate of Constantinople by the ninth century. Apparently the situation found in the Khludov Psalter—viewed here, as in other recent studies, as a patriarchal document—is representative: the patriarchate of Constantinople by the mid-ninth century had embraced the Hagiopolitan Office as a second Daily Office in addition to the Ecclesiastic Office, which remained primary.¹⁹⁵ The patriarchate in Constantinople had thus become bi-ritual by the ninth century, embracing as its liturgical canon two different public Daily Offices.¹⁹⁶ We might even argue that by the time the Hagiopolitan Office was chosen as the Daily Office for Bulgaria, it had already become the primary Daily Office in Constantinople.

We still must determine which segment of the church—more concretely, which public churches—practiced the full Hagiopolitan Office in the ninth century. In this period the Daily Office of Hagia Sophia undoubtedly was Ecclesiastic, seemingly still without any Hagiopolitan intermixture,¹⁹⁷ but what about the Chalkoprateia, another of the patriarchal churches? In the cases in which the Kanonarion-Synaxarion of the

Great Church provides rubrics for services in this church, the Daily Office in question is the Ecclesiastic Office; but how are we to reconcile the Kanonarion-Synaxarion with what was shown above—that kanons for the Theotokos's Girdle were written by George of Nicomedia and Joseph the Hymnographer for performance in that church? Were the kanons sung in Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic services? That possibility should not be dismissed but is speculative, since, as we have seen, the only evidence for Hagiopolitanized Ecclesiastic services there comes from the late eleventh century.¹⁹⁸

If the Hagiopolitan Office was a canonical office of the patriarchate in the ninth century, as argued here, but generally was not observed in the patriarchal churches, then the place of its performance within the patriarchate may very well have been other “catholic” churches. Any ninth-century public church in Constantinople in which kanons are known to have been sung is a good candidate. But many of the public churches were involved in the stational liturgy of the Great Church and thus, according to the rubrics of its Kanonarion-Synaxarion, their stational Daily Office was clearly the Ecclesiastic Office. Could the full Hagiopolitan Office possibly have been observed in public churches despite their using Ecclesiastic stational offices? To properly address this question, it is important to realize that the Kanonarion-Synaxarion of the Great Church was a liturgical book prescribing the services celebrated by the patriarchal clergy, whether in the patriarchal churches or other churches at which the synaxis of the day took place. The liturgical type prescribed for a given church by this Kanonarion-Synaxarion was not necessarily identical to that church's usual type. I therefore believe it to be possible that in a public church that normally followed the Hagiopolitan Office, the visiting patriarchal clergy celebrated Ecclesiastic stational services.

Such could have been the case at Chalkoprateia. For the feast of the Deposition of the Girdle at Chalkoprateia on 31 August, the Kanonarion-Synaxarion says only that the service is the same as that for the feast of the Deposition of the Habit of the Theotokos at Blachernae on 2 July, for which no specific rubric

195 It is tempting to float the following hypothesis: while the Great Church was the canonical center of the Ecclesiastic rite, the Nea Ekklesia, also called the “New Great Church,” was built by Emperor Basil in 880 as the canonical center of the Byzantine rite with its Hagiopolitan Office. See Dagron, *Emperor and Priest* (n. 74 above), 211–19.

196 Remember, both had the identical Euchologion, lectionary, and calendar. Which of the two Daily Offices was primary was perhaps not so clear since, unlike the Psalter that seems patriarchal, the patriarchate gave priority to the Hagiopolitan Office when choosing a liturgy for the Slavic Churches. The “ranking” might have varied according to context.

197 The earliest witness of Kanonarion-Synaxarion of the Great Church, Patmos Monastery of Saint John the Theologian MS 266, displays no trace of the Hagiopolitan Office, while the mid-tenth-century witness of Holy Cross 40 contains a few “external” Hagiopolitan elements, as noted above.

198 To the evidence above we can add that in the Gospel Lectionary of Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France suppl. grec 1096, copied in 1070 at the school of Chalkoprateia: matins with Gospel, which is a Hagiopolitan feature, on fol. 263v (Nativity of Theotokos) and fol. 266r (Elevation of the Cross).

is prescribed for matins. Because of that silence, we can speculate that matins, with the two kanons, at Chalkoprateia on the feast of the Girdle on 31 August might have been Hagiopolitan.

The church of St. Mokios, where Mark the Monk wrote Hagiopolitan hymns, is one public church that in the ninth century may have observed the Hagiopolitan Office as its regular Daily Office. Another is the church of the Holy Apostles, which no doubt was public;¹⁹⁹ in it the kanons of Ignatios the Deacon for the translation of the relics of the patriarchs Tarasios and Nikephoros were sung. As was also the case for the synaxes at Chalkoprateia and other public churches, the Kanonarion-Synaxarion of the Great Church does not provide rubrics for this day (13 March), and thus we cannot preclude the possibility that these kanons were sung in Hagiopolitan matins.

A possible distinguishing mark of the Hagiopolitan Office of the catholic/public churches is the position of the morning Gospel in matins: in the Studite and Studite-derived traditions, it precedes the canon, while in another tradition its position is between the sixth and seventh odes of the canon. The Euchologion of Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Coislin 213 (1027) observes: “Note that this prayer is not said in the Great Church but in the others in which the Gospel is said after the sixth ode at the great feasts.”²⁰⁰ These “other” churches cannot be the Studite and Studite-derived monasteries, since they do not say the Gospel after that ode.²⁰¹

199 The Church of the Holy Apostles was involved to a considerable extent in the episcopal liturgical system of the Great Church (the Kanonarion-Synaxarion of the Great Church places more than twenty synaxes in the Church of the Holy Apostles), and at least one archbishop was installed there (Arsakios in 404); see W. Mayer, “Cathedral Church or Cathedral Churches? The Situation at Constantinople (c. 360–404 AD),” *OCP* 66 (2000): 49–68.

200 M. Arranz, *L'Eucologio costantinopolitano agli inizi del secolo XI* (Rome, 1996), 94: Δεῖ δὲ γινώσκειν, ὅτι αὐτῇ ἡ εὐχὴ ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐ γίνεται, ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐν αἷς μετὰ τὴν ζ' ᾠδὴν λέγεται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους τῶν ἑορτῶν.

201 See the Hypotyposis of Stoudios (*BMFD*, 1:102); *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis: September–February*, ed. and trans. R. H. Jordan (Belfast, 2000), 10 and passim. For the earliest Russian material, see A. Pentkovsky, *Tipikon patriarkha Aleksii Studita v Vizantii in a Rusi* [The Typikon of Patriarch Alexios the Studite in Byzantium and Russia] (Moscow, 2001), 127–29, 190–92.

Parenti has shown that in Constantinople, no doubt in the ninth century, the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom replaced that of St. Basil for “regular” celebrations.²⁰² To explain this reform, he points to the proliferation of feasts. As the number of Divine Liturgies increased, it was more convenient to use the shorter anaphora of the Chrysostom text. Because the writing of Hagiopolitan hymnography—for instance, the enormous production for saints’ feasts by Joseph the Hymnographer—was also connected with the proliferation of calendrical feasts, we should not rule out the possibility that the adoption of the Hagiopolitan Office in the public liturgy of Constantinople was another part of the ninth-century liturgical reform.

The inclusion of the Hagiopolitan Office in the canonical public liturgy of Constantinople signifies that at some point, no later than the ninth century, the Hagiopolitan Office went from being a “private” Daily Office to a public one and became part of the liturgical canon of the patriarchate. Many questions remain, however, and we may ask a couple here. At how early a date did public churches of Constantinople follow the full Hagiopolitan Office? Did the early patriarch hymnographers of the Hagiopolitan Office, Germanos and Tarasios, and the ninth-century patriarch hymnographers, Methodios, Ignatios, and Photios, play a role in the process by which the Hagiopolitan Office became a public liturgy?

Toward a New Narrative of the Early History of the Hagiopolitan Daily Office in Constantinople

The research presented in this study calls for a rethinking and revision of the standard paradigm; here is a first attempt at formulating a new narrative.

No later than the first half of the seventh century, the Jerusalem Daily Office appeared in Constantinople and was practiced in one or more churches there. It was the Daily Office of the Anastasis cathedral that was received, either directly from the cathedral or indirectly via Palestinian monasticism, but of a type

202 See S. Parenti, “La ‘vittoria’ nella Chiesa di Costantinopoli della Liturgia di Crisostomo sulla Liturgia di Basilio,” in Taft and Winkler, *Acts of the International Congress: Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948)* (n. 184 above), 907–28; Taft, *The Byzantine Rite* (n. 27 above), 52–56.

preceding the developments of roughly 600, when the Horologion was reorganized and the production of the New Tropologion (hymnal) was begun. Despite being public (“cathedral”) by origin and nature, the Jerusalem Daily Office, which came to be termed *Hagiopolites* in Constantinople, started in the capital as a nonpublic (“private”) liturgical office observed in monastic or imperial milieus, outside the direct jurisdiction of the patriarch, and less likely in a public (“catholic”) church milieu. This Hagiopolitan Office was practiced in its full form, encompassing the Horologion, the Psalter, and the hymnography, rather than the partial use (mostly limited to hymnography) of the Hagiopolitan Office in Ecclesiastic services that does not seem to have appeared before the ninth century.

The Hagiopolitan Office emerges more clearly in Constantinople with the hymnography of Germanos and Andrew. The scope of their hymnography suggests a systematic project of Hagiopolitan hymn writing for the local calendar. At some point, either before Germanos and Andrew or during their time, a fusion was crafted between it and the lectionary and Euchologion of Hagia Sophia. Thus, the Byzantine rite was created through an early Byzantine liturgical synthesis, and the Hagiopolitan Office from then on formed a part of the Byzantine rite. The hymnography project of Germanos and Andrew may have been associated with this liturgical synthesis, as the Tropologion was adapted to the calendar of Constantinople.

Beginning in the eighth century if not earlier, the imperial court, with its numerous Hagiopolitan hymnographers, stands out as a privileged place for the Hagiopolitan Daily Office. The Hagiopolitan Office was observed in the main palatine church, the Theotokos church of Pharos, at least from the early ninth century, probably in the eighth century, and possibly in the seventh century if the church itself existed that early.

In addition to being widely observed at the imperial court and in monasteries, in the ninth century the Hagiopolitan Office spread extensively to public churches, which were under the direct jurisdiction of the patriarch. While this process seems largely to have bypassed patriarchal churches, a certain “Hagiopolitanization” of Ecclesiastic services did occur in one or more of those churches.²⁰³ The adoption of

the Hagiopolitan Office in public churches implies that from the ninth century onward, the liturgical canon (rule) of the patriarchate of Constantinople was bi-ritual: the Ecclesiastic Office in the patriarchal churches, and no doubt some other public churches, and the Hagiopolitan Office in a large number, no doubt the majority, of public churches.

Coda: Implications of the New Narrative

In light of the new narrative that I propose in this study, we can no longer posit the dichotomy between the Ecclesiastic and Hagiopolitan Offices as being that between “cathedral” and “monastic” liturgies. Indeed, the label *monastic* is simply erroneous and misleading; the Byzantine rite, which continues in the present Orthodox Daily Office, is typologically just as “cathedral” as the Ecclesiastic rite. Although it was not celebrated in Constantinople in the cathedral of Hagia Sophia, it originated in another cathedral, the Resurrection Church of Jerusalem. Better labels than *monastic* are *Hagiopolitan* (to distinguish the rite in Constantinople from that in Jerusalem) or *Byzantine* (as in “the Daily Office of the Byzantine rite”).²⁰⁴ Nor should we call the Hagiopolitan Daily Office “Studite,” since the Studite monastery was neither its first nor its only practitioner. It therefore also follows that in the important case of the liturgical transmission from Byzantium to Russia, the liturgy of the secular churches of Kievan Rus’ should not be termed “Studite.”²⁰⁵

Another implication of this new narrative is that we need to “de-monasticize” our *perception* of liturgical history in Constantinople: more specifically, we must “de-Studiticize” our perception of the Hagiopolitan

Hagiopolitan hymnography was sung in (either Ecclesiastic or Hagiopolitan) vespers and matins.

204 *Hagiopolitan* looks backward, while *Byzantine* emphasizes continuity with the present Orthodox liturgy.

205 This is clear both from my conclusions about the Bulgarian liturgy, which was later transferred to Russia, and from the work of Alexis Pentkovsky, who has shown that a number of the early liturgical books of Novgorod were non-Studite (see A. Pentkovsky, “‘Okhrid na Rusi’: Drevnerusskie bogoslužebnye knigi kak istochnik dlia rekonstruktsii liturgicheskoi traditsii okhridskoprespanskogo regiona v X–XI stoletiiakh [‘Ohrid in Russia’: Old Russian liturgical books as source for the reconstruction of the liturgical tradition of the Ohrid-Prespa region in the 10th–11th centuries],” in *Zbornik na trudovi od Meġunarodniot nauġen sobir: Sveti Naum Ohridski–ġivot i delo* (Skopje, 2014), 43–64, esp. 60.

203 The Jerusalem morning Gospel section figured in Ecclesiastic pannychis; and in the Chalkoprateia Theotokos church,

Office, just as our perception of liturgical history in Jerusalem needs to be “de-Sabaiticized.” In both cases the public nature of late antique and early medieval liturgy has been partly or entirely forgotten and suppressed as the idea that monasticism is the primary agent of liturgy has held sway. In Constantinople, the liturgy that monasticism embraced and promoted by

practicing the Hagiopolitan Office was simply a public and ecclesial liturgy.

University of Oslo
Blindernveien 9
0371 Oslo
s.r.froyshov@teologi.uio.no

☞ MUCH OF THE RESEARCH FOR THIS ARTICLE was carried out at Dumbarton Oaks, and I am grateful for having had the opportunity to work there. I also

wish to offer my thanks in particular to Derek Krueger and Joel Kalvesmaki for the insightful comments and suggestions they made on earlier drafts of this article.